THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL

BATTIFOL

Class 232.99Q Book B32E
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

PRIMITIVE CATHOLICISM. Translated by HENRY L. BRIANCEAU, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, from the Fifth French Edition, revised by the Author. 8vo.

HISTORY OF THE ROMAN BREVIARY. Translated by the Rev. A. M. Y. BAYLAY, M.A., from the Third French Edition.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL

"ORPHEUS" ET L'EVANGILE

BY

MONSEIGNEUR PIERRE BATIFFOL

TRANSLATED BY

REV. G. C. H. POLLEN, S.J.

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY NEW YORK

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA
1912

232.99 Q
B32E

65666

Nihil Obstat:

HENRICUS S. BOWDEN, Congr. Orat.,
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur:

EDM. CANONICUS SURMONT,
Vicarius Generalis.

WESTMONASTERII, *die* 14 *Aprilis*, 1911.

My 24 '19

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

In presenting to English readers this concise summary of the most recent arguments which can be used in defence of the historic truth of the Gospels, it has been thought advisable to alter the title, since the *Orpheus* of Reinach has not made the same impression in this country as in France. The title actually adopted will be found referred to by Mgr. Batiffol in his preface.

I have followed the author's version of all earlier writings, Scripture, Josephus, etc. Where, however, he has quoted an English author, such as Sanday, I have taken the passage from the original. I have done the same for a certain number of recent writers, Harnack, Jülicher, etc., of which there are published English translations, which can be presumed to have the approval, or at least assent, of their respective authors. In all these cases two sets of pages will be found

with each reference. The first referring to the English translation, the second to the actual reference given by Mgr. Batiffol. The following is a list of the translations employed :—

S. Reinach, *Orpheus.* Histoire générale des religions.
—— *Orpheus.* A General History of Religions. Tr. by Florence Simmonds. (Heinemann, 1909.)
J. Lagrange, *Quelques remarques sur l'Orpheus.*
—— *Notes on the "Orpheus" of M. Salomon Reinach.* Tr. Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J. (B. H. Blackwell, Oxford, 1910.)
A. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten.*
—— *The Expansion of Christianity in the first three Centuries.* Tr. James Moffatt. (Cheyne & Bruce, Theological Translations Library, 1904-5.)
—— *Lukas der Arzt.*
—— *Luke the Physician, the Author of the Third Gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles.* Tr. Rev. J. R. Wilkinson. (Crown Theol. Library, 1903.)
—— *Sprüche und Reden Jesu.*
—— *The Sayings of Jesus.* Tr. Rev. J. R. Wilkinson. (Crown Theol. Library, 1903.)
—— *Das Wesen des Christentums.*
—— *What is Christianity ?* Tr. T. B. Saunders. (Theol. Tr. Lib., 1894.)
A. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.*
—— *An Introduction to the New Testament.* Tr. Janet P. Ward. (Smith, Elder & Co., London, 1904.)
E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter J. C.*

E. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ.* Tr. Rev. John Macpherson. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1890.)

J. Weiss, *Paulus und Jesus.*

—— *Paul and Jesus.* Tr. Rev. H. J. Chaytor. (Harper, N. York, 1909.)

P. Wernle, *Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu.*

—— *The Sources of our Knowledge of the Life of Christ.* Tr. E. Lummis. (Ph. Green, London, 1907.)

LETTER FROM
Mgr. GIBIER, BISHOP OF VERSAILLES.

Dear Monseigneur,

I am glad to hear that you intend to publish the lectures given by you at Versailles on the credibility of the Gospel. By this means you will enable a larger audience to obtain the benefit previously confined to the select body present at our meetings. Yours was the first series of lectures in the course of Higher Religious Instruction which we have established in our episcopal city; and by your perfect mastery over your subject, and the practical and learned manner in which you brought before us the history of the Gospel and the life of Christ, you have ensured the success of our whole plan.

To answer the most recent objections of certain rationalists, you have quoted statements made by other rationalists, who have been overcome by the force of the evidence,

and who are drawn more and more nearly into agreement with the Catholic position as to the true interpretation of the Gospel facts. This approximation on their part is the more interesting, because the writers, by the very fact of their rationalism, exclude all idea of the supernatural, and remain outside the Church.

In the course of your criticism, you deal with the *Orpheus* of Salomon Reinach. You do not ascribe any serious importance to a book so full of arbitrary assertions, resting on incomplete and superficial knowledge, and written with evident partiality. But as the work has made some noise in the world, it was necessary to show its lack of true scholarship. You could not therefore ignore it, and you have even included its name in the title of your own work : *"Orpheus" et l'Évangile.*

Some questions will always remain difficult to answer, especially those on the relative dates of the Gospels. Which of the three Synoptics was the first to write ? And what part did the others draw from the work of their predecessors ? Such questions, however, are points on which opinions may differ without causing serious inconvenience.

The hearing of your lectures and the reading of the present book produce the impression,

or rather the conviction, that the assaults of rationalists have, above all, the effect of revealing to us new means of defence in the Gospel itself. No one can help being en lightened and strengthened by the succinct, methodical, and loyal exposition here brought before him, of the arguments founded on fact, which can be employed to confirm our faith in the Gospel.

Allow me, then, to thank you again, dear Monseigneur, both for the benefit you conferred on your hearers, and for that which you will certainly confer on your readers.

CHARLES, *Bishop of Versailles.*

VERSAILLES,
15 *May*, THE FEAST OF PENTECOST, 1910.

PREFACE.

Some leading Catholics of Versailles expressed to their Bishop a wish that a course of Higher Religious Instruction might be instituted, and, at the same time, they did me the honour of proposing my name as the first lecturer. Their project and their selection of myself were both supported by Mgr. Gibier, whose expressions of confidence in me overcame any reasons I might have brought forward for keeping silence. A hall was accordingly obtained and a numerous audience was found ready to attend. Such were the circumstances which occasioned the delivery, in January and April, 1910, of the lectures which I now bring before the public.

The subject I selected was: *What are the critical proofs of the general history of our Lord?* or, more briefly: *On the Credibility of the Gospel.* This last is the title of a work by Wallon, published some time ago, but it was easy to bring it up to date; for, although

some of his arguments are no longer available, his conclusions are those of the most definite ecclesiastical teaching.

Wallon's book was the first honest and serious attempt to introduce the critical study of the New Testament to the French Catholics of the last generation. It taught them to respect the conditions required for scientific research, if it was to produce any apologetic work of sufficient value to enlighten those whose faith was troubled by historical difficulties, or to arrest the attention of men who have not the good fortune to share our faith. The progress of historical studies in Catholic France during the past thirty years owes its value to the respect thus paid to the scientific conditions under which such work needs to be carried on.

Scholars outside our own body, who have devoted their attention to religious history, have taken up a similar attitude, and have set before us some excellent examples of the true scientific spirit. As an instance I will quote G. Boissier. In the preface to his *Religion romaine* (1874) he writes: "I have made every effort, on the one hand to guard against that indolence of spirit by which we become too much attached to received opinions, and,

on the other, against the fascination exercised over us by novelty. Nothing is further from my intention than to write a polemical work. . . . On the contrary, it seems to me that our best chance of understanding one another is to treat these questions with the calmness and impartiality befitting true scholarship. It is, in my opinion, but a poor triumph for an author, that his book should become a weapon in the hands of belligerents; what he ought rather to desire—what I myself most earnestly desire in this work which I now give to the public—is to produce what De Rossi so finely calls 'the fruits of peace and truth.'"

We were in the act of re-perusing these lines of Boissier when we received from a Jewish publisher the announcement of *Orpheus*, by Salomon Reinach. It is easy to observe the wide difference between the reasonableness of the former and the violence, premeditated rather than passionate, of the latter. In truth, *Orpheus* is aggressive; it is intended for popular controversy and claims to have as many ladies as gentlemen amongst its readers. Some 30,000 copies have been issued in France; while translations are being prepared in German, Italian, Spanish, and Russian.[1]

[1] English translation by Miss Florence Simmonds (Heinemann, 1909). See Translator's Preface.

My lectures are a Catholic reply to *Orpheus*, although it did not enter my mind to turn my course of instructions into a direct polemical answer. Except in my last lecture, the name of Salomon Reinach or of his last book was not mentioned in my Versailles lectures. Nor have I striven to reply to every error in the work, but I have rather aimed at following out the maxim of the philosopher, who advises each one to be satisfied with sweeping his own doorstep. I have taken as the ground-plan of my work the chapter of *Orpheus* on Christian origins, and I have re-written it, correcting and bringing out clearly accepted facts; and this is the whole scheme of my lectures. I have appealed to the decisions of critics, especially those from Germany, whose competence is recognized by Salomon Reinach himself. I have pointed out in footnotes the errors he has committed and the facts of which his knowledge is insufficient. Finally, at the end of the discussion, I was obliged to quote examples, in order to show the childishness of some of his analogical methods.

Orpheus has met with other critics within the last six months. Its author willingly acknowledges that his work is full of errors;

but, though we are all ready to excuse errors of fact, we cannot so easily pardon errors of judgment and of inference. Loisy[1] has called attention to a considerable number of them: so also have my two friends, Lagrange[2] and De Grandmaison.[3] Monod,[4] as a layman, points out where *Orpheus* misrepresents the nature of the religious sense. Many others have written about the book—not rabid fanatics, whose outcries Reinach professes to have expected, but philosophers and learned men, who are sorry to see a well-known scholar, otherwise a credit to France, setting his name to a work so calculated to recruit the ranks of the lowest "international" atheism.

For my friends, as for myself, I repudiate the imputation that we wish either to conceal or to sacrifice any part of our faith. The criteria to which I appeal, and to which my ecclesiastical friends, whom I am glad to quote, appeal still more strongly, are criteria founded on facts as fully as any others. We learn what is accepted, or thought probable, by men of sound sense belonging to our own

[1] *Revue historique*, Vol. CII (Nov.-Dec. 1909), pp. 304-13.

[2] *Revue biblique*, 1910, pp. 129-41, and *Notes on the "Orpheus" of Salomon Reinach* (Oxford, 1910).

[3] *Études*, 1909, pp. 24-50.

[4] *Rev. hist.* Vol. CII, pp. 300-4.

time and our own department of study; and then with reverence, patience, and prudence we verify and restore tradition. Each of us would desire to merit the title which Tertullian applies in another sense: *Illuminator Antiquitatum.* And perhaps, by acting thus, we earn more credit for French scholarship, and for science in the abstract, than if, by means of arbitrary generalizations, we undertook to philosophize about the universal history of *taboos.*

It only remains for me to thank my audience at Versailles for their attentive sympathy. The written text, now before my readers, is more cut and dried than was the spoken word; since I always improvized the form in which I delivered my matter, condensing or expanding, according to the circumstances. This, however, does not in any degree diminish the merit of my audience. My gratitude is due to the clergy, my fellow-priests of Versailles, whose presence has added authority to my teaching. Lastly, I am moved by deep and respectful gratitude to Monseigneur the Bishop, who invited me to mount this chair. I hope that my work has not disappointed his apostolic zeal.

P. B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE v

LETTER FROM THE BISHOP OF VERSAILLES ix

AUTHOR'S PREFACE xiii

THE SILENCE OF FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS: Object and intention of these lectures; the silence of Josephus about Christ; character and career of Josephus; he could not have been ignorant of Christianity; what he says of John the Baptist; of James; supposed text on Christ; later than Origen; political and literary reasons for his silence . . . 1

RABBIS AND ROMANS: Two different attitudes of Jews towards Christianity in the first century, before and after the destruction of Jerusalem; the prayer against the *minim* compared with the silence of Josephus; the story of Christ in the *Mishna;* the *Toledoth Jeshu;* the *Commentarii P incipis* and the supposed report by Pontius Pilate; Pliny the Younger on Christianity; the *Chrestus* of Suetonius; Tacitus has accurate information—perhaps from Pliny the Elder; origin of the name Christian at Antioch . . 18

THE CATHOLIC CANON: Meaning of the word; the oldest lists; artificial character of the apocryphal gospels; severity of the "Great Church" towards extra canonical gospels; Gospel dust, the *Agrapha;* the *Gospel according to the Hebrews;* the evangelical canon earlier than Marcion; the Gospels canonized because of their contents; these guaranteed by the Apostles; historic value of the selection . . . 42

SAINT PAUL: Character and career of St. Paul; historic knowledge he had of Christ; the Christ of Paul not a mere

PAGE

dogmatic entity; he knew the words of Christ; and His teaching; how he obtained his knowledge; Paul and the earlier disciples; the Church of God which he had persecuted; Weiss' theory that Paul had known Jesus before the vision on the way to Damascus; he was not in Jerusalem at the time of the Passion 64

The Author of the Acts: Harnack on the Acts; criticism returning to the traditional view; Luke the companion of St. Paul; the "we" passages; medical terms; composed at Rome in A.D. 62; Luke's point of view; his sources; the discourses attributed to Paul; to Peter; historic value of these discourses; the earliest Christian word . . . 89

The Gospels: Luke's prologue; Mark the principal source of Luke; archaisms in Mark; indebted to Peter; Aramaisms in Mark; who Mark was; the second source of Luke, called Q; Harnack and Wernle on the value of Q; characteristics; special information of Luke; characteristics of Luke; special information in Matthew; date of Matthew; Catholicity of Matthew; the Gospel of St. John; four considerations on the Johannine question 117

The Authenticity of the Discourses of Jesus: Primitive oral tradition; its reliability; the literary form of the Gospel contributes to this; guarantees of authenticity; Aramaisms; local colour; allusions to contemporary events and things; the parable or *Mashal;* parables of the Rabbis; the Gospel parables are inimitable; Jülicher's appreciation of the authenticity of the Gospels . . . 159

The Historic Certainty of the Gospel Story: The personality of Jesus is established from His teaching; critics no longer hold that the miraculous destroys the historic value of a document; eye-witnesses are not the only persons worthy of belief; nor professional historians; Jülicher and Weiss on the high value of the Gospels as sources of history; objections of rationalists to the supernatural; review of the typological argument; the symbolic argument; the comparison of religions; Reinach's attempt to apply this to the Passion; the history of dogmas; the unheard-of element in the Gospel, and its Christology; conclusions . 184

THE SILENCE OF FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS.

(9 January, 1910.)

Gentlemen,

I need not say how deeply I am touched by the kind words just uttered by Monseigneur, the Bishop.[1] If, however, I wish to re-awaken my sense of unfitness for the task before me, I have only to consider what might and should be the standard of Religious Teaching which you are inaugurating to-night at Versailles. To have it adequately carried out, you need a man of universal attainments. At least, you should have several specialists: a philosopher, an exegetist, and a theologian; and I am only an historian; still an historian who has specialized for a long time in Christian antiquity.

We shall, then, go back to this antiquity; we shall go back to its central point—that in which your faith finds its roots: the history of Christ, of His teaching, His Passion, His Death, His Resurrection, and the first days of His Church. We shall go back to those times in order to establish the historical value of what we believe; and to establish it in a critical, though loyal spirit. It is a practical and even urgent

[1] Monseigneur Gibier.

work at this time, when error is forcing its way into all stages of public teaching, and when even consciences like yours, though not darkened, may still be moved by a vague apprehension, often more to be feared than any definite objections.

Our task then, Gentlemen, is to obtain certainty, clearness of view, and intellectual peace. I shall not undertake any direct controversy, nor shall I make such a display of scientific form as to confuse you. I shall strive, in these discussions, to imitate my illustrious Roman master, the archæologist and historian, De Rossi. Some of you will recollect how, on the feast of each great Roman martyr, he was in the habit of giving a conference in the catacomb where the martyr had been laid to rest. Those who heard him will remember how he used to put life into the lessons taught by ruins, inscriptions, and paintings, concerning the spirit and Christian history of the first centuries, in accounts capable of being followed by any educated mind.

Personally, I remember a day, about the year 1888, when he took me alone with him and his beloved "fossor" Peppino, to the catacomb of Domitilla to inspect some excavations. There he brought me without warning into a *cubiculum* in the most ancient part of the catacomb, and pointed to an inscription still in place. It contained, in beautiful epigraphic characters of the first century, the name of AMPLIATI. "Do you not recognize this Ampliatus?" he said. "It is the name of the person referred to by St. Paul towards the end of the Epistle to the Romans (*Rom.* XVI. 8): 'Salutate Ampliatum dilectissimum mihi in

Domino.'" In this manner a line from St. Paul was suddenly made to live, and a word found in the depths of the catacombs brought before us a Roman dear to the heart of the Apostle. I have seldom felt so vividly what Taine calls the "historic sensation."

Monseigneur and gentlemen, we are in search of this historic sensation, or rather this historic reality, which is as convincing as it is impressive. We must first seek it in the environment of the Gospel and then in the Gospel itself. This will be our task in the very simple discourses we are going to have on the credibility due to the Gospel.

Our first lecture will be devoted to the silence of the Jewish historian, Josephus; a silence which our enemies try to employ against Christianity.[1]

I.

Flavius Josephus was a contemporary of the apostolic age, and was born at Jerusalem in 37 or 38 of our era. By birth he belonged to that aristocracy of priestly families of Jerusalem from which the Sadducean party was recruited, and which consisted of rich, opportunist Jews who were favourable to the Roman Government. Josephus has taken pains to tell us himself of the precocity of his intelligence, and how, when barely 14 years old, he was consulted by the most noted Rabbis of Jerusalem. We can at least grant that he must have been an excellent student. At the age of 16, being attracted to solitude and asceticism, he withdrew among the Essenes,

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 227 (333).

whose communities led a kind of cenobitic life on the shores of the Dead Sea. He was a fervent novice, and learned to know and admire a certain ascetic, named Banus, who confined himself to the vegetable kingdom both for food and clothing, and whose disciples claimed him as a rival to St. John the Baptist; though he was merely an Essene, more advanced in ascetical ways than the rest. Josephus found three years of this mortified life enough for him, and he then returned to Jerusalem.

He was now a Pharisee, that is, he joined hands with the popular, irreconcilable and violent party, without, however, breaking altogether with the Sadducean aristocracy. After some years of this policy, he set out for Rome in A.D. 64, with the intention of taking part in more profitable intrigues. In 66 he returned to Jerusalem at the commencement of the war which was to end, in 70, with the destruction of Jerusalem and the downfall of the Jewish nation. We cannot say how far he was a true patriot or a traitor, but he certainly took an active part in the war on the side of the Jews, and was even a general. While in command of Jewish troops in Galilee, he surrendered to Vespasian and foretold his elevation to the imperial throne. Josephus proved a true prophet, and at the end of the war we find him on the side of the conquerors. He settled in Rome, under the Emperor's protection, drawing a pension from the civil list, with the honourable title of Roman citizen and an added name of Flavius. He became rich by obtaining the estates confiscated from his compatriots in Palestine after the conquest. Thus

this "Jewish ex-priest," as Schürer calls him,[1] belongs to that despicable class of men who build up their fortunes on public calamities. He is supposed to have died in Rome after A.D. 100. He completed his *Jewish Antiquities* in 93 or 94.

I give you these details of biography and character so that you may realize that few contemporaries of the apostolic age were better able than Josephus to learn and to tell us about Christianity, even if as an outside or hostile witness.

When Josephus was 16 years old, in A.D. 53 or 54, and was so precocious a student at Jerusalem, it is morally impossible that he should not have heard speak of the disciples of Jesus. The Church was then but little more than 20 years old.[2] This improbability

[1] E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, Vol. I, p. 77 (74), "Dieser ehemalige jüdische Priester."

[2] For the chronology of the life of Christ and of the Apostolic age, see Vigouroux-Brassac, *Manuel Biblique*, Vol. III (Paris, 1908), pp. 224-39; Turner, art. "Chronology of the New Testament" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (Edinburgh, 1898); F. Westberg, *Die Biblische Chronologie nach Flavius Josephus und das Todesjahr Jesu* (Leipzig, 1910). The year of the Passion falls between A.D. 26 and 33. The year 29 is adopted by Turner; 30 appears more probable to Knopf, art. "Chronologie des Urchristentums" in Gunkel's *Die Religion in Geschichte*, Vol. I (Tübingen, 1909), p. 1808; Westberg maintains the year A.D. 33, which was the date accepted by earlier writers such as Tillemont. Cf. F. R. Hitchcock, art. "Dates" in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Vol. I (Edinburgh, 1906), where will be found a summary of the data which *Orpheus*, p. 229 *et seq.* (337 *et seq.*), has thrown into confusion in order to draw the conclusion: "In fact, less than a century after the Christian era, no one knew precisely either when [Jesus] was born, or when He taught, or when He died."

is still greater for the time of his return to the Holy City after his attempted retirement among the Essenes, during the period of seven years preceding his first voyage to Rome in 64. In 57-59 took place the arrival of St. Paul at Jerusalem, the riot which arose amongst the Jews at his appearance in the Temple, his arrest, and the other events, up to and including his captivity at Cæsarea, which are so graphically described in chapters XXI.-XXVI. of the Acts. At the moment of Josephus' arrival in Rome in 64, the persecution of Nero was just breaking out. It was of the utmost importance to the Jews to avoid all compromise with the threatened Christians. Some serious historians of our day even think that the imperial persecution was roused against the Christians by the intrigues of certain Roman Jews. Josephus was introduced at court by a great actor, Alityrus, a Jew by birth and a favourite of Nero. How then could he have been ignorant of that Christianity which was agitating all the Jewries of Rome.

II.

The silence of Josephus is an enigma, complicated by the fact that his silence is not absolute. For, in the first place, Josephus speaks of St. John the Baptist. Herod-Antipas,[1] in order to marry Herodias,

[1] In order to explain several allusions in what follows, I will give in a few words the genealogy of the Herods :—

Herod the Great (a contemporary of the Nativity) became King of Judæa in 31, and died 4 B.C. (It is known that the Christian era does not begin at the date of the Nativity.)

Of his sons :—

the wife of his brother, Herod-Philip I, had repudiated the daughter of Aretas, King of the Naboteans. She fled to her father and a war broke out between the Tetrarch of Galilee and the King, in which Herod was defeated in A.D. 36. Now Josephus, describing this defeat, says that the Jews saw in it a Divine chastisement, inflicted by God on the prince guilty of the death of "John, surnamed the Baptist." These are the words of Josephus:—

> Herod put him to death; John was a virtuous man, who urged those Jews who exercised themselves in virtue, and who applied themselves to justice, towards one another and piety towards God, to come to baptism. He taught that baptism was necessary, not that it purified from certain faults, but as a purification of the body accompanying the previous purification of the soul by justice. Men ran to him and were carried away by his discourses. Herod feared lest his words should raise a sedition, for the crowd did whatever John advised, and Herod thought it would be better to anticipate any undertaking and not to have reason to repent too late, if a movement took place.

Antipater, he put to death in 4 B.C.

Aristobulus, killed in 7 B.C.

Herod-Philip I (cf. *Mark* VI. 17), died A.D. 34 without playing any political part.

Herod-Antipas (*Mark* VI. 14), Tetrarch of Galilee, died A.D. 39.

Archelaus (*Matt.* II. 22), Ethnarch of Judæa, Idumea, and Samaria, deposed and banished A.D. 6.

Herod-Philip II (*Mark* VIII. 27), Tetrarch of Iturea and Trachonitis, King of Chalcis.

Aristobulus had a son:—

Herod-Agrippa I (*Acts* XII. 1), who died A.D. 44.

His son was:—

Herod-Agrippa II (*Acts* XXV. 13), who died A.D. 100; cf. Schürer, Vol. II, 455 (I. 780).

John, therefore, through this precaution of Herod, was sent in chains to Machærus, the fortress of which we have spoken, and was there put to death.[1]

The authenticity of this passage of Josephus is not open to any suspicion.[2]

The death of John is regarded by Josephus as a political event. The Tetrarch fears trouble in a country where popular movements grow very rapidly, and, in order to anticipate any seditious enterprise, he imprisons and puts to death the just man whom he fears to see become an agitator. Our Gospels say nothing of this political view of John's preaching. They only know how the Tetrarch is angered by the reproaches of John, because he had carried off the wife of his brother. This, however, does not contradict the assertion of Josephus.

But Josephus is a Jewish historian who sets himself to paint Jewish affairs with Greek colours. For him, John is not a prophet, but a sage, a "good man" in the noble Greek sense (*ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα*). His baptism is not an ablution conferring legal purification—that would be too Jewish—but an ablution of the body, which the wise man receives after having purified his soul by justice. Perhaps we have here a reminiscence by Josephus of the Essene ablutions. We must not expect to find Josephus recognizing the Messianic character, either of the baptism, or of the preaching of John. Josephus, in fact, has studied throughout his work to minimize and to disguise

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* Bk. XVIII, ch. v.
[2] Schürer, Vol. II, p. 24 (I. 438).

Jewish Messianism, as we might expect from a Jew who holds that the traditional Messianism is anti-Roman, and helps to isolate Judaism in the world.[1] John is, according to Josephus, only a lover of virtue, justice, and piety, who preaches to Jews, themselves also lovers of virtue, justice, and piety. Josephus speaks of religion in that rationalistic and unctuous language so dear to Robespierre. Nevertheless, we perceive the profound impression made by John the Baptist on the Jews. He is remembered as a just man, a just man who belongs to the purest Judaism, and whose murder God did not leave unpunished.

Josephus speaks of another just man, our St. James the Less. In A.D. 62 the Procurator of Judæa, Festus, being dead, and the arrival of his successor, Albinus, being delayed, Jerusalem passed into a kind of interregnum. The High Priest, Annas (Ananos) —the son of the Annas (Anne) of the passion—availed himself of this opportunity to carry out an execution which he had much at heart. This is how Josephus narrates the event:—

> Hanan, judging the occasion favourable . . . called a meeting of the Sanhedrin of judges and brought before this tribunal the brother of Jesus, who is called Christ (James was his name), and some others, on the charge of law-breaking, and delivered them to be stoned. The most equitable and respectable people of the city could not tolerate this. They secretly addressed themselves to the King, begging him to warn Hanan that he should not do this again, for the deed which he had done was not right.[2]

[1] Fr. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs* (Paris, 1909), p. 4.

[2] Josephus, Bk. XX, ch. IX.

The King here referred to is Herod-Agrippa II, King of Chalcis, Tetrarch of Iturea and Trachonitis. While Judæa was governed by a Roman Procurator, Herod-Agrippa, as a Jewish Prince, had the guardianship of the Temple, the nomination, and, if necessary, the deposition of the High Priest. At the request of the Procurator, Albinus, he deposed Annas for his excess of zeal.

Josephus sees nothing in the death of James except a political error of the High Priest. Annas convoked the Sanhedrin without the consent of the Procurator, and such a convocation was forbidden.

As a matter of fact, the Sanhedrin do not seem to have thought very seriously of this illegality, since they did not hesitate to come together and to pass judgment in accordance with the desires of Annas. It was the Jewish enemies of Annas, who seized the pretext of this unlawful assemblage of the Sanhedrin, in order to denounce the High Priest to Agrippa and Albinus, thereby driving him from his pontificate after only three months of office. The adversaries of Annas were the Jews who, like Josephus, allied themselves to the Roman power and were determined to maintain peace at any price. They saw that Annas, an imprudent and harsh man, was playing into the hands of the nationalist and zealot party.

We, on the other hand, are far more interested in James. Annas has him arrested with some other persons as law-breakers (ὡς παρανομησάντων). The word used by Josephus is ambiguous, for it leaves us in doubt as to whether James and the others are accused of violating the *laws* or *The Law*, whether it

was a revolt against Rome or against Moses. This ambiguity is quite in the character of Josephus. But the penalty inflicted on the condemned reveals the true nature of their crime. They were sentenced to be stoned, the punishment prescribed in Deuteronomy (XVII. 1-7) against anyone, man or woman, who should be found "to transgress the covenant, so as to go and serve strange gods."

The account of Josephus tells us more than he intended. It reveals that, in A.D. 62, at Jerusalem, the High Priest desired to lead the way in dealing rigorously with certain Jews, whom he accuses of renouncing their Judaism, and that the Sanhedrin, the highest authority of Judaism, agreed with the High Priest.

Josephus was 24 or 25 years of age and living at Jerusalem in 62. He could not have been in ignorance of any step in the trial of James nor of the accusation levelled against him; therefore, also, he must have known of the Christianity of James and of those accused with him. At least he knows and reports that James is "the brother of Jesus who is called the Christ (*τον ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ*)". I beg you to observe the shade of contempt with which Josephus expresses himself. He wrote of John that he was surnamed the Baptist (*Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου βαπτιστοῦ*).[1] But of Jesus, that he was called Christ, meaning the pretended Christ.[2]

[1] *Antiq.* Bk. XVIII, ch. v.

[2] The authenticity of the passage in Josephus on St. James has been disputed by several critics. Schürer, Vol. II, pp. 146,

Is this all that Josephus wrote about Christianity? Does not the incidental mention of "Jesus Who was called Christ" make us suspect that, at some earlier date in his history before 62, he had spoken more at length of Jesus?

III.

We now come to a much disputed question, as to the authenticity of certain lines, found in the XVIIIth Book of the *Antiquities*, referring to Jesus:—

> At this time appeared Jesus, a wise man, *if it be right to call Him a man.* For He did marvels; He was the master of men who received the truth with joy, and He drew after Him many Jews and many Hellenes. *He was the Christ.* On the denunciation of the first men of our nation, Pilate condemned Him to the cross; but those who loved Him from the beginning did not cease (to revere Him), *for He appeared to them risen on the third day, as the Divine prophets had foretold concerning Him, as also a thousand other marvels about Him.* The sect which receives from Him the name of Christians exists even to this day.[1]

It is obvious that those assertions, which I have set in italic type, come from a writer who believed

148 (I. 548, 581), considers it very problematical. To me it seems fully authentic, since Origen found it in his copy. He quotes three times the words: "Brother of Jesus Who was called Christ," *Comment. in Matt.* x. 17; *Contra Celsum*, I. 47; II. 13. It is true that Origen adds, as from Josephus, that the people considered the ruin of Jerusalem in 70 as the chastisement inflicted by God on the Jews, because of the murder of James. This is not in Josephus, nor in the style of Josephus. No doubt Origen, in this detail, confuses Josephus with Hegesippus.

[1] *Antiq.* Bk. XVIII, ch. III.

in the divinity of Jesus, His Resurrection, and His being the Messiah foretold by the prophets. An unconverted Jew could not have written such things, and Josephus less than any one else, since he applies the Messianic prophecies to Vespasian.[1]

It has been suggested, by Theodore Reinach amongst others, that the text is not entirely fabricated by a forger, but merely retouched and interpolated. If we cut out the words and phrases of undoubted Christian origin, what is left is quite in the style of Josephus, and even agrees sufficiently, by the shade of disdain marking certain expressions, with the tone in which Josephus would probably have spoken of Jesus. Theodore Reinach, therefore, believes that the authentic text should read as follows:—

> At this epoch appeared Jesus, called Christ, a skilful man (for He did marvels), who preached to men desirous of novelties; and He seduced many Jews and many Hellenes. Although Pilate, on the denunciation of the first men of our nation, condemned Him to the cross, those who loved Him from the beginning (*or* those whom He had misled), did not cease to be attached to Him; and the sect which receives from Him the name of Christians exists even to this day.[2]

This ingenious and attractive hypothesis has not convinced the critics; and, at the present moment, those of most weight, such as Schürer, or Fr. Lagrange amongst ourselves, refuse to see anything

[1] Fr. Lagrange, *Messianisme*, p. 6.

[2] *Revue des études juives*, Vol. XXXV (1897), p. 1 *et seq.* Cf. *Revue biblique*, Vol. VII (1898), p. 150.

authentic in the whole text of Josephus about Christ, I mean the text as we find it in all editions.[1]

No doubt, we must take into account that this text is given without hesitation in all manuscripts of Josephus, but none of these are earlier than the eleventh century. We must also remember that it is quoted *in extenso* by Eusebius of Cæsarea [2] in his *Ecclesiastical History*, which was completed in A.D. 325. But Origen, in the *Contra Celsum*,[3] published at Cæsarea in A.D. 248, bears witness to a knowledge of the texts of Josephus referring to St. John the Baptist and to St. James, but he knows of no other mention of the Saviour in Josephus except what is contained in the passage on St. James. He is even more explicit: "Josephus," he says, "did not believe that Jesus was the Christ," a clear proof that the famous passage on Jesus did not exist in the copies of Josephus in 248, but was introduced by a clumsy forger between that date and 325. This clumsiness is another argument. The paragraph relating to Jesus violently interrupts the narrative, and appears in its present position, in the middle of an account of Pontius Pilate, as a surcharge, or digression, which is quite uncalled for.[4]

[1] Schürer, Vol. II, p. 146 (I. 544); Lagrange, *Messian.* p. 19. *Cf.* Pesch, *Praelect. Dogm.* Vol. I, p. 98, who cites *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theol.* (Innsbrück), and *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, as amongst the authorities who believe the text of Josephus to be interpolated.

[2] I, 11, 7-8.

[3] I. 47 (ed. Kötschau, I. p. 97).

[4] There was another Jewish historian of the same period as Josephus, but his *Chronicle* is lost. He was Justus, called of

The enigma arising from the silence of Josephus can, therefore, be thus stated: Josephus mentions a "brother of Jesus who was called Christ" (this brother, we may mention in passing, was the son of that other Mary called *Maria Cleophae*). He could not have been ignorant of the historic personage from whom the Christians derive their name. He lived at Rome, and still more at Jerusalem, in the very midst of the agitations of the apostolic age. Why then does he say nothing about Christianity or about Christ?

Tiberias (from his birthplace in Galilee). His Greek *Chronicle* was a history of the Jewish kings, beginning with Moses, and ending with the death of Herod-Agrippa I (A.D. 44), the last Jewish king.

Photius, in the ninth century, had seen this work and observes that "Justus, filled with Jewish prejudice and a Jew by birth, makes no mention at all of the coming of Christ, of the events of His life, or of His miracles" (Photius, *Cod.* 33). Justus of Tiberias is spoken of unfavourably by his rival Josephus. As to his silence about Christianity, his case is parallel to that of Josephus. A Jewish historian of the year 100, who says no word on Christianity, is silent of set purpose and not from ignorance.

Philo, on the contrary, may have been ignorant of Christianity, or may have considered it unworthy of notice. Philo was born at Alexandria, about twenty years before our era, and died *c.* A.D. 40. He was a Jew whose range of thought was entirely Hellenic and his politics Roman. A thing so little Greek or Roman as the Gospel must have been utterly foreign to him. No historical value can be attached to the assertion of Eusebius that Philo describes Christians under the name of "Therapeutes," nor to his statement that Philo was admitted into the Christian Church and afterwards deserted it.

Wernle maintains that we can give no reason for this silence; Bousset declares that if Josephus, who must have known much, has said nothing of what he knows, it is because he did not wish to say anything. We can, without difficulty, go deeper into the matter with Schürer.[1] In all his work Josephus has striven to speak as little as possible of the Messianic hopes of the Jews. When once Jerusalem had disappeared and the Jews had been crushed as a nation, it would have been bad policy to speak of the Messiah in the nationalistic sense as accepted among the Jews. A historian who was aiming at a literary defence of the conquered people, would say nothing of deceptive national aspirations. Josephus spoke of John the Baptist without any allusion to the Messianic character of his preaching. Now he could not, writes Schürer, speak of Jesus at all and ignore the fact of his Messianic claims.

I gladly add another argument from Schürer. Josephus was writing a history of the Jews to suit the taste of the Romans. Under these conditions, and at the time Josephus wrote, Christianity could

[1] P. Wernle, *Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu* (Halle, 1904), p. 4; W. Bousset, *Was wissen wir von Jesus* (Halle, 1904), p. 16; Schürer, Vol. II, 150 (I. 548). Then read *Orpheus*, p. 227 (333): "Josephus, a Jew by birth, who wrote *ca.* A.D. 70, and who gives a detailed history of Palestine, and also of the Procurator, Pontius Pilate, mentions St. John the Baptist, who was put to death under Herod Antipas, but knows nothing of the preaching of Jesus." Reinach writes *knows nothing*, when he should have written *says nothing; Josephus wrote ca.* A.D. 70, instead of *wrote his work which was completed about* A.D. 93 *or* 94. Schürer, Vol. I, 84 (80).

only be treated in the same spirit as that which we shall see later, in the letters of educated Romans, such as Pliny or Tacitus. Christianity must appear to him to be contemptible and of no account. In addition, Josephus, writing for the greater glory of his people, could not but be tempted to keep silence about a sect which, in Roman opinion, brought so little honour on Judæa as its place of origin; besides, after more than a generation, it might be held foreign to Judaism. Thus Josephus, in speaking of Jesus and of Christianity, might have compromised the Jewish cause which he had at heart, and also his reputation as a man of letters, which he had still more at heart. To a writer so filled with vanity and opportunism as Josephus, this was more than enough to make him keep silence.[1]

[1] These reasons also hold good against the Christian interpolations which have been introduced into the Slav version of the *Jewish War* of Josephus, and which were first pointed out by A. Berendts, *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im Slavischen 'De Bello Judaico' von Josephus* (Leipzig, 1906). Cf. Schürer in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1906, p. 262.

RABBIS AND ROMANS.

(16 JANUARY, 1910.)

GENTLEMEN,

In our first lecture we had a twofold object. We studied the evidence of the Jewish historian, Flavius Josephus, in regard to St. John the Baptist and St. James; and then we explained the enigma of his silence as to the person of Jesus. We claimed that the explanation is confirmed by the fact that another Jewish historian, Justus of Tiberias, is also silent on the subject of Christ. This silence of Jewish writers is fully accounted for by their determination not to recognize Christianity. There is, then, no justification for insinuations like those of Salomon Reinach, whom we have answered without needing to quote him. This author states that the period in which we place the mission of Jesus is well known from pagan writers, and that "contemporary authors are silent about him."[1] A silence of set purpose is, in its way, an eloquent testimony.

In this second lecture we shall rapidly pass in review the other Jewish evidence for the life of Jesus, after which we shall study what can be gathered from Roman, non-Christian sources.

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 229 (333).

I.

The Jews took up two different attitudes in succession with regard to Christianity in the first century. At the beginning they sought every means of attacking it. This is the attitude revealed by the facts of the first forty years, up to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.

At no other period was there a more complete fulfilment of the words of the Gospel: "Beware of men. For they will deliver you up in councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues. And you shall be brought before governors and before kings for My sake, for a testimony to them and to the Gentiles" (*Matt.* x. 17-18. Cf. *Luke* XXIII. 34). As also the words given by St. John: "They will put you out of their synagogues: yea, the hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you, will think that he rendereth a sacrifice to God" (*John* XVI. 2). Only the Jews can here be alluded to, for they alone, and not the pagans, could have the idea of rendering a sacrifice pleasing to God. Recall now the murder of St. Stephen and of St. James the Greater. At Jerusalem the Apostles, with St. Peter at their head, thrown into prison, brought before the High Priest and the Sanhedrin, and condemned to be scourged (*Acts* v. 12-42); at Thessalonica, the Jews "taking unto them some man of the vulgar sort, and making an uproar" to provoke a riot against St. Paul and to lay hands on him; seizing his host, Jason, and dragging him and *some brethren* before the Politarchs with cries of: "They that set the world in an uproar are

come hither also, whom Jason hath received; and these all do contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another King, Jesus" (*Acts* XVII. 6-7). We have here a vivid description of their tactics: a gathering of the people, a sudden attack and a denunciation before the magistrates. Paul undergoes a similar attack at Jerusalem in 57. Some Jews from Asia, recognizing him in the Temple, stir up the people against him, crying out: "Men of Israel, help: this is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the Law and this place!" Immediately the entire Holy City is disturbed; the people rush together; St. Paul is seized and is about to be lynched, when the Roman tribune comes up with his soldiers and centurions. He arrests Paul and has him conveyed to prison. Meanwhile the mob pursue the troops and the prisoner, crying: "Away with him" (*Acts* XXI. 27-36).

A recent historian, Harnack, writes: "The Jews now sought to extirpate the Palestinian churches and to silence the Christian missionaries. They hampered every step of Paul's work among the Gentiles; they cursed Christians and Christ in their synagogues; they stirred up the masses and the authorities in every country against him; systematically and officially, they scattered broadcast horrible charges against the Christians, which played an important part in the persecutions as early as Trajan; they started calumnies against Jesus; . . . unless the evidence is misleading, they instigated the Neronic outburst against the Christians."[1] The Jews who

[1] A. Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. I, p. 57 (50).

were the contemporaries of the first generation of Christians, employed against them all the passion, spirit of intrigue, unscrupulousness and violence that can be associated in our minds with the name of Pharisee.

On the contrary, after the ruin of Jerusalem in 70, and the dispersal of the Jewish nation, hitherto united by their attachment to the Temple; after the wave of anti-semitic feeling had passed over the Empire; wherever Jewries were to be found, the attitude of the Jews towards the Christians undergoes a complete change. Suspected and reduced to impotence, henceforth they systematically ignore Christianity and keep from all contact with it. Christians become *Minim,* heretics or the rejected. In the prayer which pious Jews recite three times a day, the "Shmone Esre," is inserted a malediction against them: "May the apostates have no hope, and may the empire of pride be promptly uprooted in our days. May the Nazarenes and the *Minim* perish in an instant; may they be blotted out from the book of life; and not be counted among the just. Blessed be Thou, Jahve, Who dost cast down the proud!"[1] This prayer dates from the years A.D. 80 to 100. Perhaps we can see in this feeling of the Jews after A.D. 70 a new reason for the silence of Flavius Josephus and of Justus of Tiberias.

Jerusalem was in those days a mere field of rubbish,

[1] Fr. Lagrange, *Messianisme*, p. 294. Lagrange deals, p. 290, with the identity of the *Minim*, a debated point. As a matter of fact, the *Minim* were, above all, the Christians of Jewish race.

guarded by a detachment of Roman troops; and it remained thus until, in 122, Hadrian erected on the ruins the *Aelia Capitolina*. The most peaceful portion of the Jews from Jerusalem, those who had escaped the horrors of the siege, massacre, or slavery, took refuge on the shores of the Mediterranean, at Lydda and Jabne, two cities in which the traditions of the scribes and Pharisees were perpetuated. At Jabne the Sanhedrin was re-established under the name of *Beth-Din*. Here was gradually formed that collection of official interpretations of the Law, given by the most celebrated Rabbis, which is called the *Mishna*, and was, in fact, a development of that "tradition of the elders" already spoken of in the Gospel (*Matt.* xv. 2). In this manner a rabbinical literature arose, and it is interesting to learn from it to-day what the Rabbis of the first centuries said of Jesus. It has been examined from this point of view with extreme care by specialists whose conclusions I will summarize for you.[1]

The answers of the Rabbis concerning the personality of Jesus bear witness that, however far back we go, (the most ancient is R. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos, who lived at the beginning of the second century,) they had no recollections of their own. Whatever

[1] T. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (London, 1903). And by the same author, "Christ in Jewish Literature," in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Vol. II (Edinburgh, 1909), p. 876 *et seq.* A. Meyer, "Jesus in Talmud," in Hennecke's *Handbuch zu den neut. Apokryphen* (Tübingen, 1904), p. 47. H. Strack, *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen nach den ältesten jüdischen Angaben* (Leipzig, 1910).

they know is borrowed from the Christian Church. "With the hatred ingrained in them," writes Meyer, "they caricature the picture of Christ preserved by the Church, whether of Jewish-Christian or pagan-Christian origin." We can learn nothing new of the history of Jesus from the Talmud.

Accurate history, says another critic, was the last thing the Rabbis cared for; and it is useless to ask chronology from them. The life of Jesus is "now referred to the time of Alexander Jannaeus (104-78 B.C.), now to the time of R. Aqiba (*ob.* A.D. 135), or even later, with a variation of over 200 years. We may well hesitate to call this tradition."[1] We cannot therefore say that such data from the Talmud present insuperable difficulties.[2] A confusion which can be readily explained is not a difficulty.

Travers Herford sums up what the Rabbis know of the biography of Christ in the following lines, which I reproduce with the omission of some absurdities, several of which are blasphemous.

Jesus, called the Nazarene, Ben-Stada, and Ben-Pandira, was born out of wedlock. His mother was called Miriam, and was a dresser of women's hair (Miriam megaddelah nashaia). Her husband was Pappus ben Judah. . . . She is said to have been descended from Princes and rulers. . . . Jesus had been in Egypt, and had brought magic thence. He was a magician, and deceived and led astray Israel.

[1] Lagrange, p. 289.

[2] *Orpheus*, p. 227 (334): "The few words devoted to Jesus in the Talmud present insuperable difficulties." Reinach does not know the works of Herford and Meyer.

. . . He mocked at the words of the wise, and was excommunicated. He was tainted with heresy, called Himself God, also Son of man, and said that He would go up to heaven. He was tried by the *Beth-Din*. . . . He was executed at Lydda, on the eve of the Passover, which was also the eve of Sabbath; He was stoned, and hanged or crucified. . . . He was put to death by Pinhas the robber (Pontius Pilate), and at the time was thirty-three years old. . . . He had five disciples, and . . . was excluded from the world to come.[1]

This tissue of absurdities is a parody of facts taken from our Gospels. Out of respect for Christ, I shall not discuss the name Ben-Pandira, given to Jesus by the Rabbis. This disgusting fable, (supposed to have been invented by Celsus,) may date back to the first half of the second century.[2] The name Miriam is really that of the Virgin Mary. The description of her as a hair-dresser is a play upon words, or a confusion with the name of Mary Magdalen (Miriam Magdalaah). The royal descent of Mary is an allusion to the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. The voyage to Egypt is the flight, told by Matthew. If

[1] Travers Herford, art. "Christ in Jewish Literature," in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, II, p. 877.

[2] A. Meyer, *loc. cit.*, observes with justice that this fable is later than John VI. 42: "The Jews said: Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" It is also later than the genealogies of Matthew and Luke, and, therefore, to the affirmations of the virginal conception by these Evangelists. It is set up in derision by the Jews, as a contradiction of that claim. J. Orr, *The Virginal Birth of Christ* (London, 1907), p. 146.

Jesus is described as a magician, it is a parody on His miracles. If He mocks at the words of the wise, it is His severity towards the scribes and Pharisees that is aimed at. If He is excommunicated, it is a recollection of the opposition made to His ministry by the Pharisees, and of the fact that at one stage of His ministry, the synagogues were closed against the divine Master. His heresy, as the Rabbis describe it, is that He gave Himself out to be God, and we recall the words St. John reports them as using: "For a good work we stone Thee not, but for blasphemy; because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God" (*John* x. 33). The Rabbis have so little sense of chronology, that although they knew that the Saviour was judged by the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, they commit the anachronism of making this tribunal the *Beth-Din*, and of placing the execution of Jesus at Lydda. Some, however, have heard of Pontius Pilate, whom they call Pinhas the robber. All remember that Jesus was killed, having been put to death on the cross, according to some; and by stoning, according to others.

All these allegations are based, as we can see, on our Gospels, or more probably, on the oral teaching of the early Christians. Of serious, honest discussion or controversy, there is no question amongst the Rabbis. In fact, they prohibited all disputes between Jews and Christians. St. Justin wrote an apology of Christianity under the form of a dialogue with a learned Jew, whom he names Trypho. At one point of the discussion, he makes his adversary say: "Thus it would have been better to follow the counsel of the

Rabbis, who have made it a law that we should not associate with any of you. We ought not to have undertaken this discussion with thee." [1]

Vanquished, humbled, and hated, rabbinical Judaism shut itself in from the world, the better to be able to hate everything that was not Jewish. They had to hate Christianity in a double degree, so as to defend themselves from its teaching. The Rabbis, in their most serious schools, at Lydda, demolished Christianity by means of sarcasm; they were already following out the dictum of Voltaire: "Écrasez l'infâme!" [2]

II.

Amongst the Roman sources from which we can learn the history of Christ, we could imagine that nothing would be of greater value than official documents. There were several extensive archives at Rome, of which the first in rank are those of the Senate. The *Acta Senatus* were the reports of the

[1] Justin, *Dialog.* XXXVIII. 1.

[2] They continued this course for a long time. There exists a literary product of this Jewish spirit in a little book called *Toledoth Jeshu*, brought out in Hebrew, perhaps in the eleventh century. Raymond Martini, in his celebrated thirteenth-century work, *Pugio Fidei*, asserts that this kind of indecent and foolish "mock Gospel" already existed. It only circulated among the Jews. An analogous Jewish work was probably in existence in the ninth century. This is at least conjectured from passages in Agobard and Rabanus Maurus. See Herford, *loc. cit.* pp. 878-9. Salomon Reinach does not mention this infamous work. He should have told us that Voltaire (*Examen de Bolingbroke*, x. 11) made use of this *Toledoth Jeshu*, representing it as a work of the first century; and that in this he has been imitated recently by Häckel (*Riddle of the Universe*, c. XVII.).

sittings "for political, judiciary, or other affairs, treated of in this assembly; with the official statement of the questions proposed for discussion by the president; the decision arrived at by the assembly, an abstract of the opinions uttered by various members who took their turn to speak; the speeches or letters of the emperors and the acclamations with which they were received."[1] The Acts of our Church Councils are drawn up in the style of the *Acta Senatus*. There is, however, no historical trace of any discussion by the Senate on Christianity. There were also at Rome the Imperial archives. They contained especially the correspondence of the governors or Procurators of the Imperial provinces. The documents in these archives were called *Commentarii Principis*. In a few minutes I shall quote a document which must have been preserved in these archives and which we know by a happy exception; but, by a most absolutely strict rule, as we learn from Tacitus, no one was allowed to consult these archives.[2]

We can accept it as quite presumable that the imperial archives possessed reports from Pontius Pilate, the Procurator of Judæa,[3] and perhaps amongst

[1] P. Fabia, *Les sources de Tacite* (Paris, 1893), p. 312.

[2] P. Fabia, p. 324. "Tacitus not only tells us that the archives of the preceding reign (of Vespasian) were still existing in 70; but he also informs us that in his time no one was allowed to consult them. . . . Nothing in the *Annales* proves that an exception had been made in his favour, in spite of his connexions with the Emperors Nerva and Trajan."

[3] Cf. *Acts* xxv. 26. The Procurator, Felix, says of St. Paul: "Of whom I have nothing certain to write to my lord

them there may have been one relating the judgment and crucifixion of Jesus. This supposition is so natural that it was made by St. Justin, about 150, in his *Apologia* on Christianity, addressed to the Emperor Antonius Pius, to Marcus Aurelius, his son, to Lucius Verus, his adopted son, and to "the Sacred Senate." Justin informs them that Jesus was crucified, and that His Passion had been foretold by the prophets. As to the facts and historical details of the Passion, St. Justin says: "You can know if these things happened by consulting the acts of Pontius Pilate."[1] And further on, speaking of the miracles of Jesus, St. Justin again says: "Now that He accomplished these miracles you can know by consulting the acts of Pontius Pilate."[2]

We are in absolute ignorance whether, as a matter of fact, such an official report of Pontius Pilate, on the trial and death of Jesus, really existed and could be drawn from the archives by the Emperor. If Justin had known the document, he would have quoted it. He appears rather to take it for granted. He calls for it, as for a document he wished to have brought out of the archives, if it existed there. He has not seen it, any more than he had seen the census papers of Quirinius, when he told the Emperor and the Senate in this same *Apologia*, "Bethlehem is a borough of Judæa, thirty-five stadia from Jerusalem,

(τῷ κυρίῳ). For which cause I have brought him before you and especially before thee, O King Agrippa, that examination being made, I may have what to write."

[1] Justin, *Apol.* xxxv.; cf. xxxviii. 7.

[2] *Ibid.* xlviii. 3.

and Christ was born there, as you can learn from the register of the census made by Quirinius, your first governor in Judæa." [1]

A half-century later, in 190, another Christian

[1] Justin, *Apol.* XXXIV. 2. Our opinion as to the non-existence, at the time of Justin, of the *Acta Pilati*, fabricated by the Christians, is also the opinion of Lipsius and Harnack. It is accepted by O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Vol. I (Freiburg, 1902), p. 409. On the other hand, Reinach writes without hesitation, but also without a shadow of proof in *Orpheus*, p. 225 (331): "Pontius Pilate would have sent Tiberius a report on the death of Jesus, if only to show his vigilance. The strongest proof of the non-existence of this report is the fact that, at the beginning of the second (?) century, the Christians themselves manufactured one which is still extant (?), and which Justin and Tertullian believed to be authentic (?); and, in the fourth century, the pagans circulated another, also a forgery, which Eusebius read." Cf. S. Reinach, "À propos de la curiosité de Tibère" in *Cultes, mythes et religions*, Vol. III (1908), pp. 16-23. The story of the false *Acta Pilati* has been hopelessly confused by Reinach, who no doubt has misread the review of Stülcken's *Pilatus-Acten* in Hennecke's *Handbuch zu den neut. Apokryphen* (Tübingen, 1904), which I see in the bibliography of *Orpheus*. The facts are :—

1. Justin took for granted that a report by Pontius Pilate existed in the Imperial archives.

2. Tertullian took this assumption of Justin's for a positive assertion; and was, no doubt, influenced by the false *Gospel of Peter* (*c.* A.D. 150), in which Pilate figures as a convert.

3. In the fourth or fifth century, a pretended letter of Pilate to Claudius (for Tiberius), corresponding with the statements of Tertullian, was fabricated in Greek. Harnack, *Chronologie*, Vol. I, p. 607; Stülcken, p. 150. *Orpheus* makes a forgery of the fourth or fifth century into a document of the beginning of the second century.

apologist, Tertullian, states that everything concerning the Resurrection, and, no doubt, concerning the sentence and Death of Christ, had been reported by Pontius Pilate to the Emperor, Tiberius: "Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam pro sua conscientia christianus, Cæsari tum Tiberio nuntiavit."[1] Tertullian, then, knows of some account, in which Pilate appears as an official witness, and, at the same time, as a witness converted by what he has seen. Tertullian even believes that when the report came from "Syria-Palestine," it struck the Emperor to such a degree that he forwarded it to the Senate and asked their vote; but that the Senate refused, because they had not been consulted beforehand.[2] One is surprised that a lawyer like Tertullian should accept such a fable. Eusebius, writing about 325, has inserted the sayings of Tertullian in his *Ecclesiastical History*, but personally, he does not know this pretended report. Rather, he knew that, at the time of the Diocletian persecution, so-called Acts of Pilate had been fabricated, probably at Nicomedia, "full of all kinds of blasphemies against Christ," and that they were spread abroad in all the towns and villages by order of the Government, with directions to all schoolmasters to see that their pupils learned them by heart.[3] They thus became the first school text-books!

Having had to regret the non-appearance of the supposed report of Pontius Pilate, we at last arrive at a document of the highest value, which must have

[1] Tertull. *Apol.* 21. [2] *Ibid.* 5.
[3] Euseb. *Hist. Ecc.* IX. 5, 1.

been preserved in the Imperial archives. Fortunately the author, being a man of letters, has given it to us in his own correspondence.[1] Pliny the Younger was Imperial Legate of the province of Bithynia and Pontus from the autumn of 111 to the spring of 113. He had barely arrived in his government, when he had to deal with the persecution against the Christians. We have his report to Trajan. It seems a strange thing that a lawyer, who had been consul in 100, after previously filling the office of prætor, the highest position in the civil magistracy at Rome, should appear never to have been engaged in cases of this kind. We are tempted to say, that he had to come to this remote province of the East, not to learn of the existence of Christians, but to learn that they were less odious than public opinion considered them, and were really innocent of the crimes imputed to them.

The inquiry set on foot by Pliny has provided us with a description of the religion of these Christians of Bithynia and Pontus. He manifests the careful accuracy of a magistrate who has studied the matter of which he speaks, but he does not know them as one of the initiated, and in consequence some points are misunderstood in the report. Lightfoot, therefore, considers himself justified in identifying with the liturgy of baptism the scene in which Pliny describes the Christians as binding themselves under

[1] With Renan, Mommsen, Neumann, and Harnack, we believe that the authenticity of Pliny's letter and Trajan's rescript is not to be contested. Reinach, in *Orpheus*, p. 252 (371), writes: "The authenticity of his letter has been (quite groundlessly) suspected."

oath not to commit adultery, theft, nor false testimony. Perhaps it is to this liturgy also we can refer the celebrated assertion: "... essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem."[1] Latin scholars know that the word *carmen* does not necessarily mean a poem in measure and verse, but could, at need, signify a liturgical dialogue, such as the baptismal profession. In any case, Pliny knows that the founder of the sect of *Christiani* is *Christus*, and that the Christians looked upon him as a god. This is clear evidence of the faith of the Christians in the Incarnation.

Pliny the Younger renders justice to the purity of morals and worship amongst the Christians; the Eucharist is especially described by him as a simple and innocent nourishment. This is an allusion to the abominable calumnies circulated by pagans and Jews in hatred of the Christian worship, and particularly of its most sacred element, the Holy Eucharist. Pliny ends by saying that the Christians only incur one reproach, that of their gross and immoderate faith: "superstitionem pravam, immodicam." He has sent the accused to prison until they sacrifice to the statues of the gods, and curse Christ,—two things which those who are truly Christians could not consent to perform, even under constraint.

III.

The ignorance of Pliny the Younger as to the character of Christianity helps us to understand the lack

[1] Plin. *Epistul.* x. 96.

of knowledge on the part of one of his friends, Suetonius. In the *De Vita Cæsarum*, Suetonius, who wrote about A.D. 150, reports that Claudius (A.D. 48-54) expelled the Jews from Rome on one occasion, because they continuously made riots at the instigation of Chrestus: "Judæos impulsore chresto adsidue tumultuantes Roma expulit."[1] And in the life of Nero, he narrates that this prince was severe against the Christians, "genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac maleficæ."[2]

Suetonius shares the general opinion about Christianity: it is a new and injurious superstition; and, though he is writing half a century after Nero, he finds nothing to condemn in the bloody proscription of "the Christian name" by that prince. As to the expulsion of the Jews from Rome, in 51 or 52, he dismisses the matter in a few words. Some are inclined to take the statement as it stands, and to conclude that some man named *Chrestus* (the name can be translated *serviceable*, from the Greek χρηστός, and was common amongst slaves and freedmen), stirred up some commotion amongst his co-religionists in the Jewry in Rome; and that these tumults of the ghetto have nothing to do with Christianity.[3] This opinion is not very probable; for if this *Chrestus* had really been so obscure, Suetonius would have called him "a certain Chrestus" (*Chresto quodam*). It is far more likely that Suetonius wrote *Chrestus*, as the Romans spoke of the *Chrestiani*. Tertullian

[1] Sueton. *Vita Claudii*, 25. [2] *Ibid. Vita Neronis*, 16.

[3] *Orpheus*, p. 227 (334): "He may have referred to some obscure Jew called Chrestus."

tells us that this was the case about the year 200.[1] His *Chrestus*, therefore, refers to our Christ. We can thus see how far Suetonius was in error; he seems to believe that *Chrestus* in person caused the Jewish agitation at Rome under Claudius!

Tacitus mentions the Christians when speaking of the fire of Rome in 64, which Nero accused them of having caused. Nero being himself suspected in public opinion of having set fire to Rome in order to re-build it, found it advisable to turn the suspicions of the people towards a class which was hated on account of the abominations imputed to them: "quos per flagitia invisos vulgus chrestianos adpellabant." Tacitus writes this grave charge without hesitation; he freely accepts the accusation that the Christians are guilty of ritual crimes and infamous disorders. Pliny put aside his prejudices in A.D. 111-113; but Tacitus, writing his *Annales* between 115 and 117, is still possessed by them; if indeed he ever freed himself from them. No doubt he never came across anything Christian.

Although so badly informed on the character of Christians, Tacitus is most accurate in the few words

[1] Justin, writing in 150, says: "A name is neither good nor bad . . . but if we only consider the name under which we are accused, we are the most useful of men" (*χρηστότατοι ὑπάρχομεν*) *Apol.* IV. 1. The same play upon words is found, *ca.* 180, in Theophil. *Autolyc.* I. 1. And it is suggested that a similar allusion is to be detected in 1 *Peter* II. 2: "As new-born babes, desire ardently the spiritual and pure milk, so that you may grow by means thereof unto salvation, if you have tasted how the Lord is good" (*ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος*). Cf. *Ps.* XXXIX. 4.

which he has written about Christ, and he has evidently obtained his information from some excellent authority.

As a writer he is acknowledged to be most careful in following his authorities, and scholars have successfully identified the pre-existing documents which he employed in his work, and have thus in some degree restored the sources from which his narratives are drawn. Writing of the Christians, Tacitus says: "auctor nominis eius Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat, repressaque in præsens exitiabilis superstitio rursum erumpebat, non modo per Judæam originem eius mali, sed per Urbem etiam quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque." [1] The name Christian comes from Christ, who, under Tiberius, was sent to execution by the Procurator, Pontius Pilate. Repressed for the moment, this execrable superstition spread anew, not only through Judæa, where it began, but to Rome itself, where the followers of every kind of infamy and immorality are to be found.

The definiteness and accuracy of this statement of Tacitus, so far as it relates to Christ, makes us think that he is not reporting mere gossip, in which case, moreover, he would have protected himself by some reservation, as: *ferunt*, *dicunt*. Tacitus has not drawn his information from a Christian source, since he supposes that between the death of Christ and

[1] Tacitus, *Annales*, xv. 44.—*Orpheus*, p. 227 (355). 'The authenticity of these lines has been questioned but quite groundlessly."

the year 64, Christianity has undergone a suppression which seemed complete. Still less has he learned from a Jewish account, for he asserts that the author of Christianity is Christ. The writer to whom he is indebted was, therefore, probably a Roman.

Allow me to venture on an hypothesis with regard to this subject. We know that Tacitus made much use of a work now lost, which contained an account of the times of Nero, and was continued into the first years of Vespasian. We refer to the *Historiæ* of Pliny the Elder, who was born in A.D. 23 and died A.D. 79. He had accompanied Titus to the siege of Jerusalem in 70, as an attaché on the general staff, and had previously been governor of Syria. In his *Annales*, v. 2-13, Tacitus has a digression on the Jews and on Judæa, which serves as an introduction to the narrative of the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem. Now this description is taken bodily from the account given by Pliny the Elder in the *Historiæ*.[1] I acknowledge that we are dealing almost entirely with conjecture, but still I find it a very attractive hypothesis that the information given by Tacitus about Christ is borrowed from Pliny the Elder. The *Historiæ*, which cease at the year A.D. 71, must have been just completed; they were published by the Younger Pliny after the death of his uncle.

However this may be, the Roman authority employed by Tacitus tells us that *Chrestiani* comes from *Christus;* that Christus lived in Judæa; that he was put to death under sentence from the Procurator of Judæa, Pontius Pilatus, in the time of Tiberius.

[1] Fabia, pp. 192 and 247.

Notice the expression *supplicio adfectus*, which implies both a judicial sentence and a shameful penalty, as the punishment of the cross most effectually was. The accuracy of Tacitus is remarkable; he has not gathered a floating tradition, but gives an historical assertion, whose terms are as clear and definite as we should expect from an historian who speaks from certain knowledge.[1]

The statements of writers like Pliny, Suetonius, and Tacitus show us the opinions of the Romans on Christianity. All three were lawyers at Rome, where that profession was the stepping-stone to the highest magistracies. Suetonius was a friend of Pliny, and is thought to have known Tacitus also. All three are earnest, well educated, and in good faith. Pliny and Tacitus held in succession the chief offices of the State, the Prætorship of the City and the Consulate. Yet we see what sentiments they professed on the subject of Christianity. We can say of them what Renan says of the great Emperor-Statesmen of the second century, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus, and Marcus Aurelius: "The absolute confidence of these noble spirits in Roman discipline made them heedless of a doctrine which was represented to them as strange and obscure. . . . They were aristocrats,

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 228 (325): "Tacitus knew of a tradition concerning the death of Jesus; he can hardly be said to confirm it." We might as well say that Tacitus was an historian without critical discernment. Again, p. 229 (336): "Even the fact of the condemnation of Jesus *under Pilate* is not established." This is one of the assertions in *Orpheus* to which Reinach seems to cling most tenaciously: but it is not taken seriously by A. Loisy, *Revue Historique*, Vol. CII (1909), p. 310.

men of traditions and prejudices . . . like the English Tories, drawing their strength from their very prejudices. . . . The defects of these virtuous Emperors are those of the Romans themselves, over-confidence in the Latin tradition, pride and harshness towards the lowly, the poor, and the stranger." We pity them, not because they had the servility of a Flavius Josephus, but because they lived without a doubt of the eternity of Roman institutions, without a shadow of misgiving as to religious truth, and without a scruple of pity; for even the pity manifested by Pliny is contemptuous. Let us now try to realize what a triumph it will one day be for Christianity, to overcome, not only hateful popular calumnies, but also the pride and disdain of the most elevated Roman opinion.

IV.

We will end this part of our subject with an observation, which, although only on a matter of detail, is still not without value, and brings us nearer to the beginning of the Church than any of the preceding studies.

The first followers of Jesus and the first members of the Church called themselves "brethren," "disciples," or "saints," but never "Christians." The Jews amongst whom they lived at first described them as "Galileans," "Nazarenes," and perhaps also as "the poor"; later they styled them *Minim* or heretics. We know from Pliny the Younger that in 112 the official and legal term for them was *Christiani*, while Tacitus tells us that this was also the popular

name at Rome, in A.D. 64, for the followers of Christ. This is confirmed by a passage from the first Epistle of St. Peter, which was written about this same year 64: "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or a railer, or a coveter of other men's things. But if as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this name" (1 *Peter* IV. 15-16).[1]

The Christians, then, did not take this name, nor was it given them by the Jews, as this would have implied an acknowledgment that Jesus was the Messiah, the "Christ" or anointed of the Lord. The Acts tell us where the name of Christian arose: "At Antioch the disciples first received the name of Christians" (*Acts* XI. 26). They received, they did not take the name.[2] The time to which this passage refers is A.D. 42-43, the earliest date we have yet touched upon, and the nearest to the Passion of Christ.

About twelve years after the Passion, disciples of

[1] The authenticity of the *Prima Petri* has been denied by Baur and the Tübingen school—a denial which naturally reappears in *Orpheus*, p. 233 (350). Reinach's supposition that the *Prima Petri* was composed in order to have it believed that Peter lived at "Babylon," which we are to identify with Old Cairo, is not accepted by any serious critic, since the *Prima Petri* is of Roman origin. See J. Monnier, *La 1re épitre de saint Pierre* (Macon, 1900), p. 312 *et seq.* As to the date see Harnack, *Chron.* Vol. I, p. 454. He does not believe that it is written by St. Peter, but thinks it was composed about A.D. 83-93, or perhaps "ten or twenty years earlier." For authenticity see E. Jacquier, *Hist. des livres du N.T.* Vol. III (1908), p. 246.

[2] Harnack, *Expansion*, Vol. II, p. 16 (I. 345). F. Blass, *Acta Apostolorum* (Göttingen, 1895), p. 136.

Jesus were to be found at Antioch, then the third city in the world after Rome and Alexandria, and styled "the Metropolis of the East." These men were sufficiently prominent for the populace to brand them with a nickname. Renan and Harnack call attention to the termination of χριστιανός as being Latin and not properly Greek. They infer from this that the word may have been created by Roman authority, as a kind of police appellation. We need not go so far, since words of this termination were not rare in the colloquial Greek of merchants, soldiers, and the common people. It is sufficient for us to remember that the pagans of Antioch invented the word χριστιανός because they considered, with Tacitus, that the word Χριστός was a proper name; and they knew that Christians claimed to be connected with Christ, as disciples with the founder of their school, or followers with their leader.

One last point: the Christians, by their faith, insisted above all things on one attribute of their Master, namely, that He was the Messiah, the Christ. This is the reason why the name Christ, which was only a surname, struck pagan ears more than the name Jesus. It is good evidence of the primitive belief of Christians in the Messianic character of Jesus.[1]

[1] If we had time, it would be interesting to speak of Seneca, who died at Rome in A.D. 65, and who was, therefore, contemporary with the first introduction of Christianity into the city and also a witness of the Neronic persecution of A.D. 64. Seneca speaks very adversely of the Jewish nation, but has no word about the Christians. His silence has been noted and

explained by G. Boissier, *La religion romaine*, Vol. II, p. 55. Subsequently, in the fourth century, some persons, who were not as scrupulous as we are for the truth, made up for this silence by publishing a correspondence between St. Paul and Seneca which is a pure fiction and of very mediocre quality.—Boissier, p. 51 ; Harnack, *Geschichte der altchrist. Liter.* Vol. I (Leipzig, 1893), p. 763.

THE CATHOLIC CANON.

The New Testament is a collection of twenty-seven compositions, consisting of four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, twenty-one letters or Epistles, and ending with the Apocalypse. These twenty-seven works constitute what we call the *Canon* of the New Testament, i.e. that collection of Christian writings whose inspiration is guaranteed by the Church.

Of these twenty-seven writings, there are seven whose *Canonicity* was a subject of hesitation in the first centuries. They are: the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St. James, of St. Jude, the 2nd of St. Peter, the 2nd and 3rd of St. John, and the Apocalypse. This hesitation arose from the fact that it was disputed here or there, whether they were written by the author whose name they bore, and that all Christian Churches did not accept them. It also happened that some communities included in their canon certain works which the majority rejected, such as the *Pastor* of Hermas, and the *Didache* or *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.*

Some quasi-official lists of the works included in the New Testament by various early Churches have come down to us. Thus we have a catalogue from the Council of Carthage in 397, which is identical

with the definitive catalogue as subsequently promulgated by the Council of Trent against the Reformers, with the sole difference that the earlier Council held the Epistle to the Hebrews to be anonymous. A Roman Council of 382 gives a similar list to that of Carthage in 397, and, therefore, identical with the canon of Trent, but in this case including the attribution of Hebrews to St. Paul. This Roman list was drawn up under Pope St. Damasus. We cannot then say, with Salomon Reinach, that the canon was fixed for the West in 393 by St. Augustine—who, as a matter of fact, had no sufficient authority for such an act at that time, since he was only made Bishop of Hippo in 396.[1]

It would be another mistake to suppose that the canon of Pope Damasus and his Roman Council in 382 was the first, for there is a similar list published by St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria in 367; another, in the so-called decrees of the Council of Laodicea (Phrygia), about 363; and a still earlier one was discovered by Mommsen, of African origin and dating from A.D. 359. Lastly there exists a catalogue still more valuable than any of the foregoing, published in 1749 by the learned Muratori, who found a MS. of the eighth century, now in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. This list has been named the

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 214 (316): "This canon was practically established about A.D. 350, after the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), and was confirmed for Western Churches by St. Augustine in 393." We have here as many errors as there are statements of fact! The Council of Nice did not discuss the canon, and St. Augustine was not a bishop in 393.

Muratorian after its discoverer. It must have been drawn up at Rome in the latter part of the second century. All are agreed in dating it about the year 200. This document enumerates our four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, the Apocalypse of St. John, and another Apocalypse of St. Peter (apocryphal, and now lost). You will observe that the canon, so firmly established in the fourth century, is still a matter of some doubt in the year 200. But these doubts do not affect the two fundamental groups: the four Gospels and the Acts on the one hand, and thirteen Epistles of St. Paul on the other.[1]

My intention is to pass rapidly in review the works which the Church has rejected from the canon—the Apocrypha—and then to study by what process she has made her selection.

I.

It has been stated that every history in the beginning is overlaid with legend. This is a singularly misleading statement, if it is intended thereby to maintain that legend precedes true history. As a matter of fact, by its very definition, legend differs from myth or fable, precisely because it presupposes some historical fact on which it is built up. Legend is not a spontaneous effort of the memory, more or less vague and confused; it is an act of reflection,

[1] *Revue biblique*, 1903, p. 10 *et seq.* I have summarized the *Grundriss der Geschichte des neut. Kanons* (Leipzig, 1901), where Zahn explains the conclusions he arrived at in his *Forschungen* and his *Geschichte, etc.* The catalogues I have cited can be found in Zahn, *Grundriss*, p. 74; and in Preuschen, *Analecta* (Leipzig, 1893), p. 129.

with some historical datum as its primary element. It is our duty, as critics, to distinguish what is spontaneous from what is fictitious; and, in the fiction, to determine how far there is naïve simplicity, how far deliberate artifice.[1]

Since the history of our Saviour could not escape becoming the subject of legend, it is remarkable that artificial legend is a class of writing towards which the Church has maintained a most suspicious attitude rather than indulgence. About A.D. 160-170, a story was published in the Province of Asia which professed to describe some incidents in the life of St. Paul and of a virgin converted by him, of the name of Thecla. It was a pious fiction. Search was made for the author; and it was discovered to be the work of an Asiatic priest. In spite of his protest that he had written the story in all innocence, out of devotion to St. Paul, he was degraded from his priestly rank.[2]

[1] H. Delehaye, *Les legendes hagiographiques* (Bruxelles, 1906), p. 11.

[2] Tertull. *De Bapt.* 17. Cf. Reinach, *Orpheus*, p. 235 (345): "It is the very type of the pious fraud." True, but we can see what repugnance it inspired in Churchmen of the second century. Reinach also quotes the *Pseudo-Clementines*, stories about St. Peter put into the mouth of St. Clement, Bishop of Rome (A.D. 88-96). Reinach makes this "a frankly Judæo-Christian document," originating from "about A.D. 150," and says that the present "compilation was made in the third century," *Orpheus*, p. 242 (356). Reinach refers us to the work of H. Waitz, 1904. He should, therefore, have noticed that Waitz dates the *Pseudo-Clementines*, as we now have them, from the fourth century, and their general source from between 220 and 230. J. Chapman, *Zeitschrift für die neut. Wissenschaft*, 1908, p. 158, believes this source to be of later date than A.D. 300.

What we know of Catholicity in the second century shows that such severity was quite in keeping with the spirit of the "Great Church."

In the third century and after, this severity is relaxed, and fictions begin to appear, but they are easily recognized. One is the *Gospel of the Infancy*, ascribed to the Apostle St. Thomas, and intended to attribute to the infant Jesus a series of miracles and actions which show a very poor imagination. It dates from the third century. Another is the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, ascribed to St. James, on the birth and infancy of Mary, her espousals, and the infancy of Jesus. It is a kind of Gospel romance, of which hardly a single incident can be accepted, except those borrowed from the true Gospels.[1] This work belongs to the second half of the third, or even to the fourth century. St. Jerome is strong in his denunciation of what he styles the "deliramenta apocryphorum."

We must show clearly by examples the artificial character of these legendary writings, which belong to the second stage of Church literature, or else are derived from sources outside the Church.

About the year A.D. 170 Christianity was introduced into a country bordering on the Roman Empire, called Osrhoene, whose capital was Edessa. It remained an autonomous kingdom until 216. In the second half of the third century, there arose at Edessa a legend which made the evangelization of that city date back to the time of Christ Himself. The story went, that the King of Edessa at that time, Abgar,

[1] For a critique of this apocryphal gospel see E. Amann, *Le Protévangile de Jacques* (Paris, 1910), p. 45.

was attacked by an incurable disease; that he wrote to Jesus, of Whose miraculous cures he had heard. The letter of Abgar was shown—it has, indeed, come down to us—and also the answer of Jesus to Abgar. The Saviour excuses Himself for not being able to go to Edessa in person, but promises one day to send one of His disciples, who should cure the King completely. This introduces the second half of the legend, concerning the evangelization of the kingdom of Edessa, by Thaddeus, one of the seventy disciples. Eusebius, the great ecclesiastical historian of the early fourth century, had seen these documents, which he translated from the Syriac for insertion in his *Ecclesiastical History* (I. 13), noting that they have been obtained from the Royal archives of Edessa. But the regal stamp, whether genuine or forged, does not prevent the letters from being fictions, in which the Christians of Edessa found their own glory at the expense of the truth.[1] You will notice that the legend does not make its appearance at the beginning of history, but at the time when old, authentic recollections are fading, and new ideas unscrupulously appeal to fiction to support them.

We can find older fictions, but they are foreign to Catholic Christianity. In the second century it was characteristic of the "Great Church," i.e. the Catholic Church, that it was suspicious of novelties and of what, in the judgment of posterity, bears the name of heresy. In the heretical bands, beyond the pale of the "Great Church," daring spirits tried to support their

[1] L. Duchesne, *Hist. anc. de l'Église*, Vol. I (1906), p. 452. R. Duval, *Littérature syriaque* (Paris, 1899), p. 103 *et seq.*

doctrines by giving them the form of supposititious gospels, and by ascribing to Christ an esoteric doctrine revealed only to a few specially initiated. We thus come across a kind of trilogy of Egyptian origin—three Gospels attributed respectively to the Apostles Philip, Thomas, and Matthias. This work may date from the latter half of the second century. The few sentences we have from them suggest that these gospels were not narratives, but rather sayings or discourses ascribed to Christ, and supposed to be reported by the Apostle who heard them. St. Epiphanius, about A.D. 150, found a copy of the *Evangelium Philippi* in the hands of some Gnostics, whom he met in Egypt. In it we read some lines in which Philip is made to say: "The Lord hath revealed to me what a soul must say, when she mounteth up to heaven, and how she must answer the powers from on high. I have known myself, she will say, and I have recollected myself everywhere, and I have not procreated children to the Archon (who ruleth this visible world), but I have rooted its roots, and I have collected the scattered members, and I know who thou art. For I, saith she, am from on high. But if she hath given birth to a son, she is driven below until she can bring her children with her, and nourish them."[1] The Lord favours Philip with a personal revelation; He speaks of "powers from on high," and we are at once in fully developed Gnosticism. The same can be said of the ascension of the soul and of the merit it claims from not having

[1] Epiphan. *Haer.* XXVI. 13. (Nestle, *Novi Testam. gr. Supplem.*, Lipsiae, 1896, p. 74.)

known the work of the flesh. It would, however, be sheer loss of time if we tried to find one serious or deep thought in the whole farrago. We can never over-estimate the good sense which inspired in the Catholic Church its repugnance for such productions.

Serapion was Bishop of Antioch at the end of the second century (A.D. 190). While he was visiting the Christians of Rhossos, in Cilicia, he found them divided on the subject of a pretended *Evangelium Petri*. It seems, from certain words of the bishop, quoted by Eusebius, that he gave permission for the use of the gospel in question, with some haste and rashness, since he did not know it himself. Shortly afterwards, he was informed of the errors concealed in this sham gospel, and he at once made inquiry and found that the work had come through the hands of some Docetic heretics [1] of Antioch. Serapion at once addressed a formal condemnation of the "lies" to the Christians of Rhossos. "For we, my brethren," says Serapion, "accept Peter and the other Apostles as we do Christ, but the lying scriptures put under their names we reject." [2]

[1] Docetism is that error which teaches that the body of Christ was only an apparition. On the subject of Docetism, *Orpheus*, p. 230 (338), has a paragraph which is a blunder from beginning to end. A. Loisy, *Revue hist.* Vol. CII, p. 311.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* VI. 12. In 1886-7 about 150 lines of this *Evangelium Petri* were found at Akim, Upper Egypt. They contain the end of the account of the Passion and the narrative of the Resurrection. The story of the Passion bears clear signs of Docetic heresy. Recent critics are inclined to date the *Evangelium Petri* later than was formerly supposed, and it is now held to be a fiction produced outside the "Great

You will observe how an apocryphal gospel comes to light in a small circle of heretics in order to confirm their false doctrines; it steals by surprise into a Catholic community and immediately excites scruples, when the authority of the bishop is called in to expel the intruder.

II.

We might ask if there was no danger that this severity of the Great Church should have caused the loss of gospels which might be as valuable as those she has "canonized," and that she should have driven away traditions which seemed to differ from those she accepted. The last verse of St. John's Gospel tells us that "There are also many other things which Jesus did; which if they were all written every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written" (*John* xxi. 25). Allowing for hyperbole, this verse justifies us in thinking that oral traditions could tell us more about Jesus than written tradition has recorded. Papias, a Bishop of Phrygia, wrote about the year A.D. 150, and took pains to collect the sayings ascribed to the Apostles, or to their immediate disciples, such as Aristion. Papias knew by "oral tradition certain parables and certain teachings equally strange, and some other things very fabulous." This strangeness, which astounds Eusebius, was on points favouring millenarian-

Church" about the middle of the second century, in Syria. A. Stülcken, art. "Petrus-Evangelium" in the *Handbuch* of Hennecke, p. 79. *Orpheus*, p. 233 (343), gives what is merely an echo of an hypothesis now set aside. Hennecke, p. 38.

ism. Eusebius adds that Papias had learned from Aristion certain details of the discourses of the Lord. "He also told a story," says the historian, "about the woman accused before the Lord of many sins, which is contained in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*."[1]

These and some other fragments of Gospel have not been wholly lost; a number of sayings attributed to Jesus in ancient Christian literature, which are not to be found in our canonical Gospels, have been collected under the title of *Agrapha*. St. Paul, in his discourse at Miletus, quotes a maxim of Jesus: "It is a more blessed thing to give than to receive" (*Acts* xx. 35). Origen writes: "The Lord has said: He who is near to Me is near to the fire, and he who is far from Me is far from the kingdom." Clement of Alexandria: "The Lord announced in a Gospel: My mystery is for Me and for the sons of My house." In a MS. of the Gospels, the *Codex Bezae*, this extra-canonical passage is found: "The same day, Jesus saw one who laboured on the Sabbath, and He said to him: Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest it not, thou art accursed, and a transgressor of the Law." From Clement of Alexandria again: "Become good money-changers, test all (coins), keep the good." The *Agrapha* actually known can be found

[1] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* III. 39, 10. By ξένας τε παραβολὰς καὶ διδασκαλίας we should understand assertions contrary to the common faith. Observe the outcome. The story of the woman taken in adultery is preserved, while all that Eusebius treats as fabulous has perished.

in special collections, and some forty present points of interest.[1] Still, with the exception of the *Agraphon,* which has the incomparable guarantee of St. Paul, Reinach is right in saying that "the grains of gold in this Gospel dust are rare." We might even speak more severely with Wernle, and say, that in addition to their entire lack of authentication, we find nothing here which enriches our knowledge of the Gospel.[2]

This dust is of less value than the traces we possess of Gospels which have sometimes seemed to belong to so ancient a period, and to have been so highly esteemed, that it has been asked if they are not contemporary with our canonical Gospels. We must, however, be on our guard not to exaggerate their importance. We have already referred to the *Gospel of Peter*, and we remarked that critics have moderated their opinion as to its age. It is no longer ascribed to the period between A.D. 100 and 130, but nearer to 150; and it is admitted to be seriously probable that the author knew our canonical Gospels. It is a pious fiction from some heretical community, and there is no ground for thinking that it ever gained any esteem in the Great Church. This is also the case with the *Gospel according to the Egyptians.* At

[1] Hennecke, *Handbuch*, p. 13. E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena* (Giessen, 1905), p. 26. E. Nestle, *N.T. gr. Suppl.* pp. 89-92. To these we can add some sayings of Jesus found in a papyrus of the third century, at Behnesa in Egypt. Preuschen, p. 22. I have dealt with these elsewhere: *Rev. bib.* 1897, p. 501, and 1904, p. 481.

[2] Reinach, *Orpheus*, p. 234 (344); Wernle, *Sources*, p. 6.

one time its value was overstated so far as to make it a kind of synoptic, comparable to Matthew or Luke; but present-day critics have withdrawn from this extreme position. It is now dated from the period A.D. 130 to 150, and it is recognized that, especially in the reprobation of marriage, there is an asceticism which could only have come to light in heretical surroundings.[1]

Having rejected these two pretenders, we have only one remaining candidate who claims attention. It is the Gospel according to the Hebrews. This Gospel can be traced to the end of the fourth century, when St. Jerome still found one copy in the hands of Nazarene Christians at Beroe, in Syria, and another in the celebrated Christian library at Cæsarea, in Palestine. The title *According to the Hebrews* arose from the fact that it was used by the Christians called *Hebrews*, because they were Jews by birth and did not speak Greek. We know definitely that the gospel in question was shorter than our Gospel of St. Matthew by some three hundred lines. St. Jerome, who had the Aramaic text in his hands, thought he could identify it with the Gospel of St. Matthew, as the Apostle originally wrote it.[2] This at least shows that the Gospel according to the Hebrews coincided in its main outlines with our canonical Gospel of St. Matthew.

[1] Wernle, *ibid.* admits that these two gospels, Peter and the Egyptians, are derived from our canonical Gospels, and that, where they are original, they are without historical value. On the Egyptians, see Hennecke, p. 38.

[2] Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.* 3; Nestle, p. 76.

If we examine closely, we can recognize, in the three fragments of the Hebrews which have come down to us, that the narrative is a combination of the texts of St. Luke and St. Matthew. Hence we may conclude that the Gospel according to the Hebrews presupposes St. Luke and St. Matthew, and, therefore, also St. Mark.[1] The writer had the intention of giving the *Hebrews* an Aramaic Gospel which should dispense them from reading our Greek Gospels, and which, at the same time, should correspond more closely with their special traditions. In the story of the Resurrection, for instance, the first person to whom the risen Saviour appears is St. James, "James the Just," instead of to St. Peter, because, for these Hebrews James was the leader of Apostolic Christianity. In the narrative of the Baptism, the Spirit resting on Jesus thus speaks to Him: "My son, I awaited thee in all the prophets, I waited that thou shouldst come, so that I might rest in thee." A little later Jesus says: "Now My mother hath taken Me, My mother who is the Holy Spirit, she hath taken Me by one of My hairs, and she hath transported Me on to the great mountain of Thabor. . . ." These words introduce the account of the Temptation. You will notice that the Holy Spirit is termed *mother* because in Aramaic the word rucha, *spirit*, is feminine. Observe also, that where the Synoptics say that Jesus was led or driven by the Spirit into the desert, the Gospel according to

[1] Wernle, p. 6 (contra Harnack). A. Findlay, art. "Apocryphal Gospels," in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Vol. I, p. 676.

the Hebrews adds the detail that Jesus was transported to Mount Thabor. This kind of detail does not necessarily guarantee greater accuracy. This is even rendered less probable by the assertion that Jesus was taken by one of His hairs—clearly a reminiscence of what is related of Habacuc and Ezechiel (*Dan.* XIV. 35; *Ezec.* VII. 3).

It is not impossible that the special traditions of these *Hebrews* may have preserved some incidents of real value. One of the sayings attributed to Jesus in the gospel runs as follows: "Rejoice only when you look upon your brother with charity." So pure a thought may well be authentic, but other sayings, on the contrary, wound us by their coarseness or platitude. But æstheticism is clearly no satisfactory criterion. If it be true that the incident of the woman taken in adultery is inserted in our St. John from the Hebrews, then we have proof that this gospel preserved, on this precise point at least, a fragment which Loisy calls "authentic, amongst the most authentic of the Gospel."[1]

The only definite conclusions we can come to are that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was written to replace our three Greek Synoptics for Christians who spoke Aramaic, and that it may date back to the last years of the first century.[2] This was the sole

[1] A. Loisy, *Quatrième Évangile*, p. 542.

[2] Wernle, p. 8 (6). *Orpheus*, p. 233 (343), attributes a gospel to Cerinthus, and states that "from a very early period the Gospel of St. John was attributed to him (Cerinthus), as being only a revised edition of his own." As a matter of fact, there is no trace of a gospel written by Cerinthus—only the *Alogi* (heretics who denied the doctrine of the *Logos*) attri-

gospel of a people whose language set them apart from the rest of the Great Church. If there was no eagerness to translate this Aramaic Gospel for the use of Greek Christians—if, when translated by St. Jerome in the fourth century, it was not preserved—this was probably not because it militated against the traditional faith, but rather because it taught nothing that was not already known from more reliable sources.

III.

Whatever may be the original dates of our three Synoptical Gospels, we know that the Gospel of St. John was the last, and that it belongs to the period of A.D. 90-100. The question, therefore, arises, how this group of four, this *Tetramorph*, was established, and how it became a definite unit, a closed canon.[1]

It is the custom amongst Protestant critics to solve this question by asserting erroneously that "the first idea of a canon dates from A.D. 150," and that it was "Marcion who formed the first collection of the kind, which included Luke and the majority of the Pauline Epistles."[2]

buted the fourth Gospel to Cerinthus, in order to discredit it. Cf. Loisy, p. 18. The statement of *Orpheus*, that there was another gospel by Cerinthus, which served as the first stage in the composition of the Johannine Gospel, rests upon no foundation whatever.

[1] This question has been treated by Rose, *Études sur les Évangiles* (Paris, 1902), p. 3. He gives a very acute criticism of Harnack, *Gesch. der altchr. Literatur; die Chronologie*, Vol. I (Leipzig, 1897), p. 681.

[2] The expressions are those of Reinach whose opinion they indicate.

This error has been keenly defended by Harnack, but I think Zahn judges more correctly when he sees, with Tertullian, a mutilated and altered Catholic Bible in the "Bible of Marcion." That heresiarch left the Catholic Church because he could not reform it in accordance with his own views. The Marcionites formed an organization of churches in imitation of the Catholics, and Marcion gave them a *regula fidei* also, but he founded it on a single Apostle, St. Paul. He repudiated the whole of the Old Testament and only kept ten Epistles of St. Paul. Then he attempted to unify the existing Gospels. Marcionites were to have their gospel, but only one instead of four; a gospel of which Luke was to form the basis, but a Luke which had been expurgated and brought into conformity with Marcionite dogma—and with additions from Matthew and John.[1] This unification was a violent *a priori* work, an arbitrary reform; but it presupposes an existing canon, in which the Old Testament was joined to the New. It also presupposes the four Gospels, our *Tetramorph*, and no traces of any other. Marcion did not create the canon, he repudiated the canon already established in the Church, and substituted his reformed one in its place.[2]

[1] J. Weiss, *Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 409, reminds us that certain critics of the last century supposed the gospel manufactured by Marcion to have been the primitive form of Luke, and adds: "This opinion has now been rightly abandoned." But *Orpheus*, p. 221 (325), has not yet abandoned it: "He (Marcion) seems to have possessed the original Luke."

[2] Zahn, *Grundriss*, p. 27.—Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 490 (445), accepts Harnack's theory, but with a very significant

We are told that this is proved not to be the case, since previous to Marcion (A.D. 140-170) there was no canon, not even for the Gospels. "All the quotations from 'the Scriptures' in the works of the Apostolic Fathers (or early orthodox Christian writers) refer exclusively to the Old Testament."[1] This shows a total ignorance of the facts. We have only to consult the latest history of the New Testament, that of Leipoldt. There we shall find evidence that the Gospels, by which I understand the sayings of Jesus, are quoted as Scripture under the formulæ: ὡς γέγραπται, ὡς εἴρηται, e.g. in the epistle attributed to Barnabas (A.D. 98-100, or at latest 130-150); and in the Didache which is earlier than the Epistle of Barnabas, both works belonging to the group of Apostolic Fathers.[2] From this we conclude—and it can be proved in other ways—that primitive Christians revered one sovereign authority, the Word of Jesus. "But be not you called Rabbi. For one is your master, and all you are brethren; . . . one is your master Christ" (*Matt.* XXIII. 8, 10). The "Word of the Lord" is a law to Paul in all

reservation: "How far Marcion employed the old established Church formulæ in referring to and making use of this bible of his, we do not know; but certain it is that he looked upon it as a canonical authority, every word of which was sacred." How then can Jülicher maintain that Marcion inaugurated the canon and that the Catholic Church has merely imitated him? To the same effect, Windisch, *Zeitschrift für die neut. Wissenschaft*, 1909, p. 172.

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 215 (316).

[2] J. Leipoldt, *Geschichte des neut. Kanons*, Vol. I (Leipzig, 1907), 125.

that it declares and enjoins. The "Word of the Lord" is the Word of God, and the mission of the Holy Ghost is to recall to the Apostles all that the Lord has told them.[1] But who guarantees the Word of the Lord? The Apostles, since they are the witnesses of the Lord. Hence the expression, with its claim to revelation: *The Gospel according to. . . .* The book is canonized (the thing is of more account than the word, this is only of the fourth century) by its contents; and its contents are guaranteed by their essential conformity with the teaching of the Apostles, or rather by the very signature of an Apostle. The process of canonization is different, I think, for the Epistles, but this was certainly the canonization of our four Gospels. The catalogue is closed as soon as the Gospel according to St. John makes its appearance. Witness, some years later, the letters which we possess from St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch (martyred between A.D. 110 and 117, if not sooner). In these Epistles we can find traces of many sayings of the Lord. Ignatius uses the two Gospels which bear the names of Apostles, those of St. Matthew and St. John.[2] Zahn, who has gone deeply into the subject, declares that "in Christian literature, between A.D. 95 and 140, we find a multitude of examples showing the ecclesiastical

[1] *John* XIV. 10, 26. Cf. 2 *Peter* III. 2. Jülicher, p. 464 (423); Leipoldt, p. 104.

[2] Leipoldt, p. 122. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Vol. I (Cambridge, 1903), pp. 15, 19. One quotation from St. Ignatius (*Smyrn.* III. 2) may be taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

use of our four Gospels, and only four quotations which cannot be derived from them."[1]

Our three Synoptical Gospels, which led the way for the Gospel of St. John, were obviously not canonized on a given day by a formal vote of the Church. But that does not permit us to say that these are books which owe their good fortune to the fact that they were much read or much loved, for in that case the canon would contain many works which we do not find there. Nor can we say that the Catholic canon was formed by putting together the books which, being "read in the majority of the large churches," were "considered in harmony with the average opinion of Christendom."[2] This empirical criterion would have opened the canon to many books which have been excluded from it, e.g. the epistles of St. Clement of Rome, who was a contemporary of the fourth Gospel; while it would, at the same time, have caused the rejection of many books which we find in it, such as the Johannine Apocalypse,

[1] Zahn, *Grundriss*, p. 39. For detailed, perhaps even overscrupulous precision, see Stanton, p. 1. Harnack, *Chronologie*, Vol. I, p. 690: "Assuredly Papias knew the fourth Gospel, Mark and Matthew; and Eusebius could not find a trace in him of the use of any foreign gospel, nor any opinion about any extra-canonical gospel." Compare this with the statement of *Orpheus*, p. 217 (320): "There were a great number of writings called Gospels. The Church finally adopted four, guaranteeing their inspiration and absolute veracity, no doubt because they were in favour in four very influential Churches, Matthew at Jerusalem, Mark at Rome or at Alexandria, Luke at Antioch, John at Ephesus." This is all random talk.

[2] *Orpheus*, p. 217 (317).

a book singularly beyond "average opinion." The criterion which decided the canon, that is to say, the test applied in selecting or rejecting books, must have been a criterion which can account for the selection actually made; and this was the Apostolic guarantee.

The first generation of Christians believed the Word of Jesus, which had for it primary and supreme authority, then the authority of the Apostles of Jesus.[1] Ultra-liberal Protestant critics teach that the primitive Christians, the "Urgemeinde," recognized the authority of the Apostles as third in rank, after the Word of God (the Old Testament), and the Word of Jesus Christ.[2] The Apostles were "those," writes Jülicher, "whom the Lord had appointed and to whom the greatest charge, the Gospel, had been entrusted. To reject them meant to reject the Lord; to contradict them was to contradict the Gospel; they were the authentic interpreters of the perfect revelation of God in Christ." This is why the letters received from them were inserted in the canon; this is why, still more, the only Word of the Lord which was accepted was that guaranteed by the Apostles. The Gospel according to St. Matthew and the Gospel according to St. John were received as Gospel Word, because they bore the names of those Apostles; the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Luke, because they were considered as guaranteed, the former by St. Peter, the latter by St. Paul. The criterion applied by the Church was the criterion of authority; and in its turn, this

[1] See my article in the *Revue biblique*, 1903, p. 226.

[2] Jülicher, p. 472 (428); Leipoldt, p. 182.

authority constituted a guarantee of origin and veracity.[1]

With her instinct for seeking the sounder side and her scrupulous regard for the truth, the faith of the Church has been found to produce a true scientific work. She has *preserved;* and this is always more scientific than arbitrary reformation. Renan asks why she was not tempted to reduce the four Gospels to one, either by suppressing three, or, after the example of Marcion, by constructing an *a priori* gospel; and he answers: "We can never find a better instance of the Church's honesty than in this circumstance."[2]

Wernle laughs loudly at the preference of so many "inquiring laymen" for the apocrypha; they seek in them some new light on Jesus, which, they think, the Church has deliberately tried to hide from them. These "amateurs," continues Wernle, are only too eager, after the example of Häckel and Voltaire, to give full confidence to an imposture like the *Toledoth Jeshu*,[3] while they refuse to trust our Gospels. "Nowadays, however, the apocrypha are beginning to lose at least some of the charm they derived from interdict and mystery, since all the world may read them." And only too many are disappointed by their reading. "It is no doubt true that the collectors of the New Testament writings were good Churchmen,

[1] Stanton, p. 269, speaks in this sense. Cf. *Orpheus*, p. 215 (317): "There could, of course, have been no question of a scientific criterion, based on the origin and history of these writings."

[2] Renan, *L'Église chrétienne*, p. 501. [3] See above, p. 26.

who were guided in their choice by ecclesiastical requirements and considerations. But they were only working in the direct line of Christian progress. Such a selection and compilation of what was practically authenticated, and of service to the community, was being made, consciously or unconsciously, from the earliest existence of a community of disciples." [1]

[1] Wernle, p. 7 (6).

SAINT PAUL.

(23 January, 1910.)

Gentlemen,

I shall not occupy your time needlessly in setting before you, even in a summary, the life of St. Paul. I should teach you nothing that you do not already know, or that many excellent books cannot teach you. Allow me only, in passing, to point out to you the work of R. P. Prat, *La théologie de Saint Paul* (Paris, 1908). He does not give us those picturesque accounts which we find so attractive in some other writers, but in the discussion of all critical and dogmatic questions, his book is the most accurate and reliable, and, I may add, the most elegant exposition we possess.[1]

You will find in that work, in particular, an entire chronology of the life and work of St. Paul. The Passion of the Saviour is hypothetically fixed at the

[1] Until the second part of Prat's work is completed, those who wish to study the *doctrine* of St. Paul, should consult the synthetic account of J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes*, Vol. I (Paris, 1905), p. 82; or the monograph of E. Tobac, *Le problème de la justification dans St. Paul* (Louvain, 1908). Then compare with the sixty lines of *Orpheus*, p. 236 (347), on the doctrine of St. Paul!

year A.D. 30, the conversion of St. Paul falls in the year 34; from 34 to 42 he lived in retirement, first at Damascus, where he became a Christian, and later at Tarsus, his native city. In 42 Barnabas associates him with himself in the mission at Antioch. Paul now becomes a missionary and continues in that capacity till his death at Rome in 66 or 67, that is to say, during some twenty-five years of active work and preaching. From this missionary labour there remain to us the Epistles, of which we count thirteen or fourteen, according to our inclusion or exclusion of the Epistle to the Hebrews amongst the personal letters of St. Paul.[1] The critics of yesterday, with Baur, only recognized the great Epistles (Galatians, Corinthians 1 and 2, and Romans). The extreme Dutch school, with Van Manen, accepted neither great nor small; but critics of to-day, with Jülicher and Harnack, admit, as of undoubted authenticity, all the Epistles which bear the name of St. Paul, with the sole exception of those called Pastoral (Titus and Timothy 1 and 2).[2] Harnack is even of opinion that,

[1] Prat, p. 506, admits that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is unknown, but insists that the doctrine is Pauline. Jacquier, *Histoire des livres du N. Test.* Vol. I (Paris, 1903), p. 482, agrees with this, but is, perhaps, even more emphatic. Cf. Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 160 (147).

[2] Reinach, *Orpheus*, p. 236 (347), suspects the authenticity of the Epistle to the Philippians, under pretext that the state of organization of the Church disclosed in it is more advanced than in the great Epistles. Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 81, mentions this opinion as one of the theories of the Tübingen school, "almost universally abandoned." And again, p. 108, he writes: "The theory of Baur, who makes all the Epistles

in the course of the Pastoral Epistles, the compiler has introduced considerable fragments of authentic Pauline writing.[1] I do not insist on this point, since, for my present purposes, I have no need to draw my arguments from the disputed Epistles; we believe, however, that there are no valid grounds for disputing them.

We should remember that the two Epistles to the Thessalonians must have been written about the year A.D. 51; the great Epistles (Cor., Gal., and Rom.), 56-57; those of the captivity (Col., Eph., Phil., and Philem.), 61-62; and, finally, the Pastoral Epistles in the last years of the Apostle, about A.D. 66. This is the chronology of Prat, which we shall follow.

Paul was a contemporary of the Apostles. We do not go so far as to say that he was the soul of the Apostolic age, as if he had been the only Apostle of the Gentile world; as if he alone had borne "the solicitude of all the Churches," or as if the whole Græco-Roman Christendom had received no other preaching than his "Gospel." It is one of the paradoxes of the Tübingen school, with Baur, that the Christianity of the Gentile world was pure "Paulinism."[2] We cannot ignore the missionaries who

post-Pauline, is now supported only by the Dutch ultra-critics, who do not accept the authenticity of any Pauline epistle."

[1] J. Weiss, *Die aufgaben der neut. Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart* (Göttingen, 1908), p. 33, writes ironically: "Whoever can accept the authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians has no longer any right to dispute the Pastoral Epistles." This is precisely our opinion.

[2] This is only one out of many paradoxes from that school. For a critical account of Baur's system of Christian origins, a

preached for ten or twelve years before Paul had joined the Apostolate; those missionaries who are unknown to history by name, but who laboured efficiently before Paul, at the same time as Paul, and after Paul's work was ended. We have none of their letters—barely do we obtain a glimpse of one or two in the Acts. Scripture has not recorded their share of the work;—on the contrary, the personality of Paul seems to predominate everything, even when he himself does not desire it. He appears as if drawn out of proportion, like the old representations of St. Christopher. The force of his eloquence helps to create this illusion; I defy anyone to read the eleventh and twelfth chapters of 2 Corinthians without receiving this impression.

However high and "elect" his personality,—however exceptionally lit up he may be to us by his Epistles and by the Acts,—Paul was still *unus ex multis*, he formed a part of the general body of "all the Churches" which he knew so well, and to which he had been converted. He was united to that "Church of God" of the first days, which he had persecuted, and to which he had been converted at Damascus, under the hands of Ananias. We shall see this more clearly when we study the nature of the evidence which Paul gives on the history of the Saviour.[1]

system still adopted by Renan, see the interesting and incisive pages devoted to it by Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 12. D. Eck, art. "Baur und die Tübinger Schule," in Gunkel's *Die Religion in Geschichte u. Gegenwart*, Vol. I (1909); also G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse Le Protestantisme* (Paris, 1898), p. 88.

[1] I shall have occasion to refer to the controversy, *Jesus and Paul*, aroused by Wrede's pamphlet, *Paulus* (Halle, 1905).

I.

Paul had, in common with these Churches, an historical knowledge of Christ, of which his Epistles give evidence. We will turn our attention to two passages from the first Epistle to the Corinthians:—

Now I make known to you, brethren, the gospel which I have preached to you, which also you have received, and wherein you stand; by which also you are saved, if you hold fast after what manner I preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all, which I also received: How that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures: and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures: and that He was seen by Cephas: and after that by the eleven. Then He was seen by more than five hundred brethren at once: of whom many remain until this present, and some have fallen asleep. After that, He was seen by James, then by all the apostles. And last of all, He was seen by me also, as by one born out of due time. For I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. . . . If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God that He hath raised up Christ; . . . (1 *Cor.* xv. 1-9; 14-15).

The "Gospel" which Paul here refers to so briefly, is not a gospel in the sense of being a narrative of the life and teaching of the Saviour; "gospel" is used

This dispute has been summed up by L. Venard, in the *Revue du clergé française*, 15 Sept. 1909, p. 689. See also the answers of Anglican theologians, D'Arcy, Robinson, Knowling, and Headlam, in the Church Congress at Swansea, 1909 (cf. *Guardian*, 13 Oct. 1909, p. 1637). Also Sanday, art. "Paul," in Hastings' *Dict. of Christ and the Gospel*, Vol. II, p. 888. For Lutheran theologians, A. Jülicher, *Paulus und Jesus* (Tübingen, 1907), p. 3; J. Weiss, *Paul and Jesus* (Harper, N. York, 1909).

here as synonymous with preaching,[1] and this preaching turns on one sole point, the Death and Resurrection of Christ.

Christ died for our sins and rose again the third day "according to the Scriptures." Jesus is the Christ, because the Scriptures prophetically reveal Him as Christ.[2] The historic fact of His Death and Resurrection is guaranteed by the testimony of those who were witnesses. Christ, risen from the dead and glorified, is the centre of our faith; if He be not risen again, then our faith is vain, and we are more miserable than all other men. But who dares to say that we are false witnesses? We are those to whom the risen Christ showed Himself, first to Peter, then to the eleven together, then to more than five hundred Christians at once, then to James, then to all the Apostles, and lastly to me, Saul, on the way to Damascus. Paul is certain that he has seen the risen Saviour and he knows that the others have also seen Him, and of these the majority are still living and can bear testimony with him. These assertions of Paul date from A.D. 56-57, less than thirty years after the events, and the witnesses he appeals to are eye-witnesses.

Our second passage from 1 Corinthians treats of the Last Supper:—

For I have received of the Lord that which also I have delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which

[1] Prat, p. 53; E. Buonaiuti, *Saggi di Filologia e Storia del N.T.* (Rome, 1910), p. 22.

[2] As to the part played by prophecy in St. Paul's historic evidence, see Rose, *Études évangéliques*, p. 285.

He was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, broke, and said: Take ye and eat: this is My body which shall be delivered for you: this do for a commemoration of Me. In like manner also the chalice, after He had supped, saying: This chalice is the testament in My blood: this do ye, as often as ye shall drink for the commemoration of Me. For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until He come (1 *Cor.* xi. 23-26).

Here we have another portion of the "gospel" of Paul, by which I mean his catechism; the elementary teaching of that Christianity of which he was a missionary. The Last Supper, when Jesus instituted the Eucharist—that Eucharist which Christians celebrated in memory of the death of Jesus—the Last Supper is an event which finds its place in the outline of the life of the Saviour. "The night in which He was betrayed." As St. Paul was not himself present at the Last Supper, he attests to the Corinthians that he has received the story in a manner which gives him complete certainty of the fact and of its significance. "You shall show the death of the Lord." The Eucharist is a liturgy established in all the Churches, it is a memorial, a representation of the death of the Lord, that death by which we are redeemed.[1]

[1] We must notice that critics, who are not apologists for our faith, have seen in the words "you show" an allusion to some liturgical recitation of the story of the Eucharistic institution. W. Schmiedel, in the *Hand-Commentar*, Vol. II, p. 132. Jülicher, *Paul and Jesus*, p. 20 (11): "The words of institution in the Lord's Supper, which even then had become a fixed form, presuppose a detailed picture of the Supper. The words 'In the night, when the Lord Jesus was betrayed' surely

Christ was not, in St. Paul's mind, a being evolved from pure dogmatic reasoning, perceived by his speculative genius or his internal experience; nor did he develop the idea from the Christ dwelling within him, "vivit in me Christus" (*Gal.* II. 20). He knows of a Jesus who lived upon earth, "born of a woman, and born under the Law" (*Gal.* IV. 4), the Law of the Jews. A man, "like unto us" (*Phil.* II. 7), at least outwardly; who took upon Himself the most humble state of life, that "of a servant" (*ibid.*); and who carried out the sacrifice of Himself "unto death; even to the death of the cross" (*Phil.* II. 8). Paul insists on the fact of Christ's crucifixion, as a fundamental article of the creed which he preached. I could cite numberless texts to show the use he makes of the words "cross" and "crucify." At least, we may recall the following:—

> The Jews require signs, and the Greeks seek wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, the power of God and the wisdom of God (1 *Cor.* I. 22-24). And I, brethren, when I came among you, came not in loftiness of speech or of wisdom; declaring unto you the testimony of Christ; and Him crucified (1 *Cor.* II. 1, 2).

This is saying, in other words, that the transcendental dogmatism of St. Paul presupposes facts; and these facts are the historic life of Christ, His Passion

contains *in nuce* a large part of the history of the Passion. The reference to 'the night' implies a chronological knowledge of the events in question, the words 'the betrayal' imply knowledge of the traitor and the arrest."

and His Resurrection; and that in his preaching the affirmation of these facts is of primary importance. "Oh, senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you?" (that you should turn away from the Gospel),—you, "before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been set forth, crucified among you?" (*Gal.* III. 1). If, in the whole course of St. Paul's Epistles, there was only this one passage on the crucifixion, "set forth before the eyes" of the newly converted, as the decisive argument, we should be unable to accept the assertion of *Orpheus*: "Paul . . . in his Epistles to distant communities, which, when he wrote, had no Gospels, never seems to have felt the impulse to enter into details concerning the earthly life of Jesus."[1]

II.

We shall see that we can go far beyond the facts already established, for Paul appeals to the sayings of the Saviour: "Not I, but the Lord commandeth, that the wife shall not depart from her husband" (1 *Cor.* VII. 10). This is a paraphrase of the words of Jesus on the unlawfulness of repudiation (*Mark* X. 7). Again: "The Lord ordained that they who

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 231 (339); repeating what he had said before in *Cultes, mythes et religions*, Vol. III (Paris, 1908), p. 23. Reinach is only reviving a theory, now out of fashion, from the Tübingen school. J. Weiss, *Paul and Jesus*, p. 17 (10): "In the time of Baur, Holsten, and Pfleiderer the concession was far too readily made, that Paul knew but little of the historical Jesus. . . . We must now attempt to review the prevailing opinion. Mission work among the heathen could have had no vitality unless it had been based upon definite narratives of Jesus' life." So also Jülicher, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 30 (55).

preach the gospel should live by the gospel" (1 *Cor.* IX. 14). Some see in this an echo of the words of Jesus to the seventy disciples: "The labourer is worthy of his hire" (*Luke* X. 7). But we may conjecture that this is from a saying now lost, which expressed even more closely the idea of St. Paul. It is evident and acknowledged that, for Paul, the "Word of the Lord" was *the* authority, the new Law, the indisputable rule.[1]

In many passages of the Epistles the thought of the Apostle agrees with the maxims of the Gospel, and the relationship is so clear that we cannot doubt the parentage.

Bless them that persecute you: bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that rejoice, weep with them that weep (*Rom.* XII. 14-15).

is an obvious reminiscence of the Sermon on the Mount, and it is not the only one.[2]

The teaching of Jesus is unique in its literary and dialectic expression, and no one has imitated it. We must not, therefore, be surprised that Paul, with his Rabbinical and Hellenic education, presents the teaching of Jesus in a different form to that given in the Synoptics. It is only the more remarkable that the essential principles of this teaching should be so faithfully reproduced in the Epistles of St. Paul.[3]

The first step taken by Jesus was to free His

[1] Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 465 (424); J. Leipoldt, *Gesch. des N. T. Kanons*, Vol. I, p. 105.

[2] J. Weiss, p. 12; W. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans* (Edinburgh, 1905), p. 381.

[3] Prat, p. 17; J. Weiss, *Aufgaben*, p. 11 *et seq.*

disciples from the servitude of Pharisaic formalism, and from the strict observance of the letter of the Law. The Law was, in the eyes of Jesus, merely a temporary arrangement, now to be superseded. This principle being laid down, the message of Jesus must, sooner or later, lead to a rupture with Judaism. St. Paul, in contributing to the completion of this rupture with more prominence than any other, was only carrying out the spirit of the Gospel, by bringing forward those arguments which were lying in the background.[1] "Christ," he says to the Galatians, "hath made you free, stand fast, therefore, and be not held again under the yoke of bondage" (*Gal.* IV. 31; v. 1). The whole Epistle to the Galatians is a development of this principle; but the principle itself is only the expansion of the thought underlying the answer of Jesus as to the Temple dues: "What is thy opinion, Simon? The kings of the earth, of whom do they receive tribute or custom? of their own children, or of strangers? And he said: Of strangers. Jesus said to him: Then the children are free" (*Matt.* XVII. 24-25).

The great commandment, according to Jesus, and the one which includes the whole Law in its essence, is the love of God and of our neighbour. Let us read what St. Paul says on this subject:—

> Owe no man anything, but to love one another. For he that loveth his neighbour, hath fulfilled the Law. For: Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is comprised in this word,

[1] J. Weiss, *Paul and Jesus*, p. 43.

Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. The love of our neighbour worketh no evil. Love, therefore, is the fulfilling of the Law (*Rom.* XIII. 8-10).

Another principle in the teaching of Jesus is the paternity of God. The novelty of the Gospel teaching consists partly in the revelation that man has a Father in heaven, and that religion will henceforth be a filial adoption. Paul points out in striking terms this contrast between the Law and the Gospel :—

Now as long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from the servant, though he be the lord of all ; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed by the father. So we also, when we were children, were serving under the elements of the world ; but when the fulness of time was come, God sent His Son, made of a woman, made under the Law ; that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because you are sons, God sent the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying : Abba, Father. Therefore now he is not a servant, but a son. And if a son, an heir also through God (*Gal.* IV. 1-7).

This invocation of God under the name of Father, which comes directly from the Gospel, is a familiar invocation to St. Paul, as also the idea of the adoptive sonship of the Christian :—

You have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear, but you have received the spirit of adoption of sons, whereby we cry : Abba, Father. For the Spirit Himself giveth testimony to our spirit, that we are the sons of God ; and if sons, heirs also : heirs indeed of God, and joint heirs with Christ (*Rom.* VIII. 15-17).

Christ is the natural heir, while the Christian is co-heir by adoption. Similarly, the Christian is a

child of the Father who is in heaven, but Christ is Son in an unique and incommunicable manner. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 *Cor.* I. 3). And "Ye are Christ's: and Christ is God's; . . ." (1 *Cor.* III. 23). The distinction between these two sonships is drawn immediately from the teaching of Jesus.

Writing to the Romans, Paul says: "The kingdom of God is not in meat and drink, but justice and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (*Rom.* XIV. 17). In order to show that scruples on such questions as food are secondary, he sums up the Gospel concept of the kingdom of God, considering it as a whole, both in the future world and in the conscience; and points out that the supreme condition is justice, and the fruits of this, namely, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. He again refers to that concept of the kingdom which depends on the justice of the Christian, when he writes to the Corinthians: "The kingdom of God doth not consist in words, but in deeds" (1 *Cor.* IV. 20). He does the same in another passage to the same community: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (1 *Cor.* XV. 50). Paul does not stop to define the "kingdom of God." It is sufficient to pronounce the words, in order to call up in the minds of his readers a host of thoughts and images which are familiar to them, as to Christians conversant with the Gospel.

We could multiply instances of the correspondence between the Epistles and the Gospel, but those I have cited are fully sufficient to establish the thesis I am defending: that Paul's doctrine is derived from

the teaching of Christ. I certainly do not deny that many points of revelation rest on the personal authority of St. Paul, for he received special supernatural light; nor do I call in question that his teaching bears the indelible impress of his mental education, of the development of his thought and his experience; none of these factors can be ignored;[1] but this very duty of including all factors necessitates our recognizing the part, and the large part played by the knowledge derived by Paul from the Word of his Divine Master.

III.

Whence did Paul obtain his historic knowledge of Christ? We may reply, in the first place, that St. Paul learned to know about Christ, not from one or other of our Synoptical Gospels—not even from St. Luke—but from one of those previous essays to which St. Luke alludes in his prologue. We cannot imagine that the Christian religion could have been preached without some written memorandum of the teaching of Christ; some writing analogous to the one which is supposed to have served as a common basis to Matthew and Luke. I say analogous, for the two examples we have quoted above from the "gospel" of Paul, the story of the Last Supper, and the account of the Resurrection, do not coincide in detail with the tradition established in Luke and Matthew nor with that of St. Mark. So prudent a critic as Sanday considers that the written source referred to by Paul

[1] Prat, pp. 50-62.

must have been distinct from those on which our Evangelists base the account they have adopted.[1]

In default of a written account, or more probably in addition to a written account, Paul could not have been ignorant of what the "disciples" of Christ taught about Him. In A.D. 42 the faithful of the Church at Jerusalem, hearing that an important body of converts had been formed at Antioch, sent Barnabas to instruct and organize this new community, which had sprung up from the preaching of "certain men from Cyprus and Cyrene." Barnabas is delighted with all that he finds; he exhorts the faithful of the young community "to continue with a firm heart in the Lord." He preached in his turn, and a great multitude "was added to the Lord" (*Acts* XI. 20-24). The book of the Acts, which I am following, continues in these words: "Barnabas then went to Tarsus, to seek for Saul, and having found him, he brought him to Antioch. Now it happened that, for a whole year, they held assemblies in that church and instructed a numerous multitude. So it was that at Antioch that, for the first time, the disciples received the name of Christians" (*Acts* XI. 25-26).

In this manner Paul comes out of the long retirement which followed his conversion and baptism

[1] Sanday, *art. cit.* p. 889 (contra Resch). More precisely, Sanday denies that Paul had in his hands our canonical Gospel of Mark. As to the source Q, common to Matthew and Luke, we must suppose that Paul had a text of this kind, a "manual for Christian missionaries to put into the hands of their converts;" but it is more than we can affirm to say that Paul used exactly our source Q.

at Damascus in A.D. 34. Barnabas goes to seek for him at Tarsus, where he knows Paul to be living for six or seven years, far from any thought of an apostolate. Barnabas brings him to Antioch and associates him with himself in this great Greek city, where, by his Greek culture, Paul will be of valuable assistance to him. You are to understand that Paul is assistant to Barnabas, and therefore Paul's teaching must, in the budding Christian Church, have been similar to that of Barnabas. It would be an untenable paradox to maintain that Paul was here an independent and isolated teacher. We must observe, moreover, that the collaboration of Paul and Barnabas was not limited to this common preaching at Antioch in A.D. 42-43. On Paul's first mission, from A.D. 45-49, he was the companion of Barnabas; they preached in Cyprus, then in Pisidia and Lycaonia, returning finally to Antioch, whence they had set out, "and they abode at Antioch no small time with the disciples" (*Acts* XIV. 27). They were sent out by the Christian Church at Antioch, they were its apostles, and they preached its faith in Christ. Consequently we can draw the conclusion, that Paul knew whatever was known about the historic Christ in the Christian Church of Antioch in A.D. 42-49.

We can go back to a still earlier date. Paul, after his conversion in A.D. 34, passed through Jerusalem on his way from Damascus to Tarsus. This visit must have taken place in A.D. 37. "I went up to Jerusalem," he writes to the Galatians, "to make the acquaintance of Cephas, and I tarried with him fifteen days; but other of the apostles I saw none:

saving James the brother of the Lord" (*Gal.* i. 18-19). Paul gives Peter the name Cephas, which is the surname he received from Jesus and which indicates the Apostle as the rock; it is sufficient for Paul if he sees Peter. But did he merely see him? Paul says, *ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν*, which suggests the idea of conversations, of questions asked and of narratives. Paul, a new convert, spends two weeks making inquiries of the most notorious witness of the Resurrection and also of the ministry of Christ. When he writes later on of the risen Saviour, "He appeared to Cephas, then to the eleven," Paul might, doubtless, have added that Peter had personally vouched for the fact.[1]

Three years before this Paul was at Damascus, immediately after the vision which he had of the risen Christ on the way; he is visited by "a disciple named Ananias," who lays hands on Paul, giving him back his sight, and he is immediately baptized. The Acts continue: "Paul passed some days with the disciples who were at Damascus, and immediately he began to preach in the synagogues that Jesus is the Son of God" (*Acts* ix. 10; 19-20).

Are we to say that the voice which was heard on the way to Damascus revealed to Paul the whole of

[1] Jülicher, *Paul and Jesus*, p. 55. Jülicher shows that this deduction does not contradict *Gal.* i. 16. C. Weizsäcker, *Apostol. Zeitalter* (Tübingen, 1902), p. 372, had already observed that Paul, when dealing with the Gentile Christians, made use of the words of Jesus, as indisputable precepts: "Assuredly he took up this attitude at the same time that he received the words, that is, at the feet of the Apostles of the first hour."

Jesus and the Gospel? Must we assert that before this moment Paul knew nothing, and that immediately after he had nothing more to learn? No doubt we can cite some texts of St. Paul which might favour this, notably: "I declare to you, brethren, the gospel that I preached is not according to man, for neither did I receive it of man, nor learned it, but by a revelation of Jesus Christ" (*Gal.* I. 11). Nevertheless, the commentators, with Estius for instance, observe that although God could, in one moment's intuition, give Paul an explicit and integral faith, He still sends him to Ananias for baptism and instruction. The statement of Paul, that the Gospel had been revealed to him by Jesus Christ, must not be taken too literally. A supernatural intuition and the sound of the voice of Christ—these were the miracles which converted St. Paul suddenly, and which truly gave him the Gospel, in the sense in which the Gospel can be contained in a light as brief as a flash of lightning, and in that single speech: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest" (*Acts* IX. 5).

We must also not forget that the Jesus to whom Paul was converted, was the same Jesus whom he had persecuted in His disciples. He says, with pathetic humility, to the Galatians: "You have heard speak of my conduct in the Jewish religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted and laid waste the Church of God, and how, in the Jewish religion I surpassed many of my age and nation, being to excess a jealous partizan for the traditions of my fathers, when it pleased Him who had set me apart from my mother's womb, and who hath called me

by His grace, to reveal His Son in me" (*Gal.* i. 13-15).

Did Paul know nothing of this Church of God which he laid waste and persecuted with unmeasured passion, and with a Pharisaic violence more intolerant and jealous than the most extreme and youthful of the Pharisees? The Acts give us details: Paul assisted at the death of Stephen; and the accusers of Stephen—Deuteronomy imposed on the accusers and witnesses to cast the first stones at the condemned person—these accusers laid their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul; and, in order that we may not overlook Saul's complicity, the Acts continue: "Saul approved of the murder of Stephen" (*Acts* VII. 58, 60; XXII. 29). We can therefore argue: if Paul approved of the murder, it is because he knew the charge and had been present at the trial of Stephen before the Sanhedrin, and had heard the questions put to him by the High Priest, and his answer.

Again we read in the Acts, that the movement of the Jews against Stephen commenced in the synagogues of Jerusalem; and that amongst them were those of "the freedmen, the Cyreneans, and the Alexandrians," and, in combination with these, "the Jews from Cilicia and Asia;" and we immediately remember that Saul was a Jew from Tarsus in Cilicia.

Do not forget that Paul was not a stranger passing through Jerusalem. He had been sent to Jerusalem when hardly more than a boy from Tarsus, where his parents resided. "My life," he says afterwards, "is known to all the Jews from

the first days of my youth (ἐκ νεότητος), since it was passed at Jerusalem, in the midst of my nation. Knowing me for so long a time, they know, if they will bear testimony, that I have lived as a Pharisee, according to the most rigorous sect of our religion" (*Acts* XXVI. 4-5). Paul is still young at the time of the martyrdom of Stephen, since the Acts term him νεανίας—we might give him thirty years of age. He had therefore lived in the Holy City some ten or fifteen years. We know that he was studying for the profession of a scribe, a career which could lead to anything even for Jews who had no advantage of birth, since the whole education of a Jew consisted in the knowledge of the Law. We know besides that, as a student, he had for master a Rabbi of Jerusalem who was reckoned among the most celebrated and obtained the surname of "The beauty of the Law." Paul was able to say: "I am a Jew, born at Tarsus in Cilicia; but I was brought up in this city (Jerusalem), and instructed at the feet of Gamaliel, in the exact knowledge of the Law of our fathers" (*Acts* XXII. 3). We learn from the Acts that Gamaliel was one of the Sanhedrin at the time that an inquiry was made into the missionary work of the Apostles in Jerusalem before the case of Stephen. You will recall the wise words spoken by Gamaliel on that occasion (*Acts* V. 33-39). Assuredly Paul did not share the sentiments of his master, he must rather have judged him wanting in zeal, for he himself went much further. In that world of students and synagogues (political *clubs*, we might almost call them), in that keen agitation, where

discussion so soon led to denunciations for capital offences, how could Paul remain ignorant of the teaching for which he saw Stephen die, and for which he heard Gamaliel plead a toleration which Pharisees like himself would not grant? How, in a word, could Paul have been ignorant of this Jesus, in whom His followers acknowledged the Messiah? This Jesus was not a mythical person or metaphysical being; He had been condemned by the Sanhedrin and crucified at Jerusalem four years before the stoning of Stephen and Paul's own conversion. All this must have been known to the myriads of citizens in Jerusalem, where there was such an agitation against the disciples of this pretended Nazarene Messiah. We arrive then at the conclusion that, before himself acknowledging the leadership of this Jesus whom he was persecuting, Paul cannot have been in ignorance of the faith of Jesus' disciples.[1]

IV.

Some recent critics, not members of our body, have believed that they could go beyond this conclusion, and assert that Paul recognized Jesus on the road to Damascus, because he had already known Him and seen Him with his own eyes. In answer to the paradox of Wrede, who supposes that Christ was only an abstract being and a creation of Paul's dogmatism, Johann Weiss has expended a great deal of ingenuity

[1] These conclusions are also those of Jülicher, p. 55; Weiss, pp. 4-12; Rose, *Études évangéliques*, p. 282; Lemonnyer, *Épitres de S. Paul*, Vol. I (Paris, 1908), p. 163; E. Mangenot, *La resurrection de Jésus* (Paris, 1910), p. 20.

to prove that Paul knew Jesus by sight. I own that this hypothesis appears to me of secondary importance, and, in addition, the arguments of Weiss seem to me misleading.[1]

His first point consists in saying that the vision which Paul received on the road to Damascus was an hallucination. Now, in hallucinations, the images which present themselves to our mind are always formed from elements which already exist in the memory. The vision of Paul is consequently inconceivable, unless we suppose Paul to have had in his memory a vivid recollection of Jesus. To this we can answer, first, that if the vision of Paul was a miracle, it was an hallucination outside the ordinary rules, and therefore we cannot argue "psychologically" about it, as does Weiss.—Secondly, supposing that the vision followed all the laws of psychology, the knowledge which Paul had of the faith of the Christians whom he was persecuting, would have been sufficient to represent Jesus as his chief adversary; and this would have been enough to explain the words: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest," without having recourse to an hypothesis of a previous meeting.

The other argument consists in finding texts in St. Paul's Epistles which directly indicate that Paul had seen Jesus. There are two of these texts, of which the first is taken from the first Epistle to the Corinthians. Paul enumerates the titles he has to be received as an authentic Apostle. "Am I not an apostle," he says, "have I not seen Jesus our Lord?"

[1] J. Weiss, *Paul and Jesus*, p. 16.

(1 *Cor.* IX. 1). Others have objected that this text does not solve the question, for it may simply allude to the vision on the road to Damascus. But we can go further. If St. Paul had seen Jesus in the course of His ministry or His Passion, he certainly could not found any argument on this meeting in favour of his Apostolate, since such a meeting would have taken place while he was still an adversary of Jesus.

Weiss' second text is from the second Epistle to the Corinthians: "The love of Christ urgeth us. . . . He died for all, to the end that they who live, no longer live for themselves, but for Him who died and rose again for them. Henceforth, therefore, we know no one according to the flesh; and if we have known Christ according to the flesh, we know Him now no longer in this manner" (2 *Cor.* v. 14-16). All are agreed that Paul, in saying *we*, is speaking of himself, the context from which the passage is drawn leaves us no doubt on the subject. It is then Paul whom the charity of God urges; it is he who will henceforth know no one according to the flesh; it is before his eyes that the old things have passed away and all things have become new. This is a way of saying, that in the light of faith, he no longer judges things "according to the flesh," or according to the judgment of one who has not the faith. Paul formerly knew, or more correctly, judged Christ "according to the flesh;" according to that which appeared right to his mind when it was sincere, indeed, but without the light of faith. Now he no longer knows Christ in this manner.—You see, says Weiss, that Paul had known Christ according to the flesh, Christ in His

outward appearance, Christ in His human lowliness.— But this conclusion is forced, for the saying of the Apostle has its full meaning, if he is thinking of the time when he knew and judged Christ according to His human qualities only, taking Him for a seducer of the people, a blasphemer, an enemy of the Temple and the Law, and for a public scandal. Paul wishes to express the same contrast which he indicates elsewhere, when he writes to the Corinthians: "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling-block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness: but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, the power of God and the wisdom of God; for the foolishness of God is wiser than the wisdom of men, and the weakness of God is stronger than the strength of men" (1 *Cor.* I. 23-25).

Although we have shown that Weiss has not proved his hypothesis, we might still be asked, if it is not possible that Paul, who was present at the martyrdom of Stephen at Jerusalem, may also have been in the Holy City at the time of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ. No, even this possibility must be set aside. If we suppose Paul to have been in Jerusalem when Jesus came there for the last Pasch, and that he was present at the scenes in the Sanhedrin and the Pretorium, being a violent Pharisee, he would have been one of the opponents of Jesus. His would have been one of the voices in the crowd which cried out: "Crucify Him." And if he so humbly reproached himself for having persecuted the Church of God, in what terms would he not have accused himself of having taken part in the sufferings of Christ? We

prefer to believe, with the majority of critics, that Paul was not at Jerusalem when Jesus appeared there.

Paul was some twenty years old when the Galilean ministry of Jesus began. The studies which he had carried on as a youth at Jerusalem were now over, and he had left the school of Gamaliel and gone back to his native city of Tarsus. The care of his health, which was always delicate, would probably have demanded this. When he returned to Jerusalem, where he had some connexions and where later he was to have a married sister, he found the synagogues in a state of ferment on the subject of the Nazarene prophet lately crucified. He threw himself into the controversy with all his noble enthusiasm, and ended in being converted by Jesus Himself to the faith of those disciples whom he was persecuting.

THE AUTHOR OF THE ACTS.

(30 January, 1910.)

Gentlemen,

Amongst the opinions of former days, which ecclesiastical critics have continued to defend steadfastly and perseveringly, there is one thesis which can be stated in the following words:—The third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles are the work of one and the same writer, who is St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul; and the Acts were completed at the date at which the recital ceases, namely the year 62, towards the end of St. Paul's captivity at Rome, and before his acquittal at the tribunal of the Emperor.

On the other hand, there are few theses which appear to adverse critics more open to the charge of *ecclesiasticism.* They no longer venture, at the present day, to date the Acts from the middle of the second century, as they did in the palmy days of the Tübingen school, nor even from about A.D. 120; but neither do they venture to affirm that this book was composed before the end of the first century. The most accepted opinion in Germany, if I may judge from Weiss and Jülicher, fixes the composition of the Acts at the period A.D. 100-105.

We were, therefore, agreeably surprised at seeing

a critic of such exceptional authority as Harnack coming over, at least approximately, to the old opinion which we defend,[1] and you will not, I hope, take it amiss, if I set before you the conclusions of Harnack as to the author and date of the Acts, by way of introducing what the work itself has to tell us of the Gospel history.

I.

We must not be under the delusion that Harnack is a scholar on his way to the Catholic Church. He professes not to believe in miracles, the institution of the sacraments, or the validity of ecclesiastical dogma, especially about Christology. You can imagine how much Christianity Harnack has left after this; a vague piety towards God, considered as the Father, a piety to which Jesus has, he thinks, given the highest and most effective expression.[2] Jean Jacques Rousseau would have found nothing to object to in this profession of faith, which reproduces that of his Savoyard vicaire.

But, on the other hand, Harnack is, of all European scholars, the one who best knows the Christian literature of the first centuries; and if we have the right to reject some of his views on the history of dogma, or of ecclesiastical institutions, our very eclecticism permits us to admire his superior erudition,

[1] A defence of the same opinion by the philologist Fr. Blass, *Acta Apostolorum* (Göttingen, 1895), was widely commented on.

[2] P. L. Grandmaison, "Le Christ de M. Harnack" in the *Études* of March, 1902, p. 737; G. Goyau, *L'Allem. relig. prot.* p. 93.

his brilliant generalizations, and, at times, the courage he has shown in his work. For in the present condition of religious criticism in Germany, considerable courage is needed for a scholar of his rank to denounce what he rightly calls "the impressionalism that is the ruling fashion in the biblical criticism of to-day," [1] and to set to work to substitute for it a method of strict observation of accessible facts, however the results may run counter to the theories most in vogue.

Some twelve years ago, Harnack wrote as follows in the preface to his great work on the *Chronology of Ancient Christian Literature* (1897). His pages produced a great impression :—

"There was a time, and the general public is still at that date, when it was considered necessary to hold the most ancient Christian literature, including the New Testament, as a tissue of deception and falsehood. That time has now passed.[2] For science,

[1] Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. v (iv). The word *impressionalism* is not sufficient for Harnack to designate the species of criticism he combats. He has used elsewhere (*ibid.* p. 87) two phrases considerably stronger : "dry logic (saübernde Logik) and intolerable pedantry." He also gives a note full of keen irony on the snobbishness of those who take their criticism of the New Testament at second hand, in the *Sayings of Jesus*, p. 3. A similar severity is to be found in W. Wrede, cited by Lagrange, *Revue biblique*, 1903, p. 625.

[2] It has not yet passed for Reinach, who writes: "Examining the sacred books of the Church, we have found forgeries on every hand," *Orpheus*, p. 243 (357). And elsewhere, p. 234 (345), speaking of the Acts : "The rivalry of Peter and Paul is intentionally modified, in a spirit of conciliation ; we note the originality of the writer in this trait." This is one of the

this was a time during which she learned much, and after which she had much to unlearn. The results of my investigations go in a reactionary sense far beyond what one might call the moderate position in the criticism of to-day. The most ancient literature of the Church is, on all chief points, and in the majority of details, veracious and worthy of belief from the point of view of literary history. In the whole New Testament there is probably only one work which can, strictly speaking, be called pseudonymous, it is the second Epistle of Peter."[1] Critics have abandoned the theories of Baur and the Tübingen school, who could only justify themselves by systematically upsetting primitive literary history; still there remains in criticism a tendency to look upon primitive texts as criminals before a police magistrate, "fixing their attention on all kinds of details in order to argue against clear and decisive conclusions." The texts are charged with being full of insinuations. At the least, a scepticism is shown which is ready to give equal weight to what is probable and what is improbable. But fortunately there are signs of a retrogression. "I do not hesitate to use the word *retrogression*, for things should be called by their right names. In our criticism of the most ancient sources of Christianity we are, without any doubt, in course of returning to tradition. The

abandoned theories of Baur and the Tübingen school. Jülicher, *Introduction*, pp. 14, 398; Rose, *Actes des Apôtres* (Paris, 1905), p. xxii.

[1] For a defence of this book, see Jacquier, Vol. III, pp. 284-308.

problems arising from the criticism of the sources, and still more those from deciphering the origins of doctrinal and historical tradition, as well as the difficulties in the way of constructing true history, will probably present themselves, in a few years, under an aspect essentially different from what they bear to-day, to the majority of competent critics." [1]

The bearings of such a declaration cannot escape anyone; and they did not escape that Dutch theologian (Holland is the place where impressionalistic criticism has gone to the limit of the absurd) who remarked to Harnack that, if we accept the data of tradition as they are presented to us by tradition, we must abandon the attempt to write "a natural history of primitive Christianity," and accept the supernatural.[2] The Dutchman did not reason so badly, whatever Harnack might reply.

The retrograde movement of Harnack has been confirmed during subsequent years by his researches on St. Luke. In the preface to his *Luke the Physician* (1906), he writes: "The genuine Epistles of St. Paul, the writings of Luke, and the history of Eusebius are the pillars of primitive Christian history. This fact has not yet been sufficiently recognized in the case of the Lukan writings; partly because critics are convinced that these writings are not to be assigned to St. Luke. And, yet, even if they were right in their supposition, the importance of the Acts of the Apostles, at least, still remains fundamental. However, I hope to have shown in the following pages

[1] Harnack, *Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1897), Vol. I, pp. vii-x.
[2] *Ibid.* p. x.

that the critics have gone astray in this question, and that the traditional view holds good. The Lukan writings thus recover their own excelling value as historical authorities ; for they are written by a Greek who was a fellow-worker of St. Paul, and companied with Mark, Silas, Philip, and James, 'the brother of the Lord.'" Harnack repeats his declaration, now some six years old, about the retrograde movement of criticism towards tradition. His friends are offended, he says, because they do not understand his meaning. He wishes it to be clearly understood that —although there are many things in tradition which he rejects—"during the years A.D. 30-70 and on the soil of Palestine—more particularly in Jerusalem—this tradition as a whole took the essential form which it presents in its later development." [1]

In other words, the Gospel history is constituted from elements which were already fixed between A.D. 30-70 on the soil of Jerusalem ; and this is the same as saying that the tradition in question is that which the Christian Church, at its very beginning, received from the Apostles. The work which radical critics assign to the faith of the first generation of Christians, elaborating, sublimating, and in a sense creating its own object, this work is purely hypothetical. Such hypotheses require to be discussed, but only after we have made due allowance for the primordial

[1] We shall see later all the force of this statement, when we discuss the attempts made by the school of the "history of religions" to present Christianity as a Græco-Roman syncretism.

factor, the pre-existence of a tradition inherited from the immediate witnesses appointed by Christ.[1]

II.

We must first establish the identity of Luke. The third Gospel bears his name, and the Acts of the Apostles professes to be a continuation of the third Gospel, a sort of second book, dedicated, like the first, to a person of quality, otherwise unknown, called Theophilus.

No one disputes that this Luke is the Luke of whom St. Paul speaks when writing to the Colossians, while he was a prisoner at Rome in A.D. 61-62, "Luke, the beloved physician, salutes you, as also Demas" (*Col.* IV. 14); and at the same period to Philemon: "Epaphras, my companion in captivity in Jesus Christ, salutes you, as also Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, and Luke, my fellow-workers" (*Philem.* 24). At the time Paul wrote his second Epistle to Timothy, Demas had left him and gone to Thessalonica, Mark is with Timothy, and Paul adds: "Luke alone is with me" (2 *Tim.* IV. 11). Limiting ourselves to the first two texts, which are dated from Rome, we infer that Luke accompanied the Apostle when a prisoner, that he was a fellow-worker with him in the apostolate, that he was at Rome with him, although free, and that he is at the same time *his* physician; for that is the force of the words *beloved physician*, in which St. Paul describes Luke. We infer also that, if Luke had been with Paul when he was writing to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans, his presence would

[1] Cf. Weizsäcker, *Apostol. Zeitalter*, p. 369.

have been mentioned. It has been asserted that Luke was a native of Antioch, and this is not unworthy of belief.[1]

The book of the Acts of the Apostles will throw more light on the little Paul tells us of his beloved physician. Of the twenty-eight chapters in the Acts, we find that, from the sixteenth onwards, there are zones in the text in which the narrator, instead of continuing his recital in the third person, speaks of *we*. Now these zones form distinct episodes or continuous journeys; and we can conclude that these sections of the narrative are by a writer who took part in the events which he narrates. In A.D. 50 Paul is at Troas, and from a vision which he receives he decides to pass over to Macedonia. Then appears the expressive *we:* "After this vision of Paul, we immediately sought means to go to Macedonia" (*Acts* XVI. 10). The mysterious *we* is Paul's companion in Macedonia and at Philippi, then after some days he disappears (XVI. 10-17). Paul, however, continues his mission, he preaches at Athens and Corinth, and finally returns to Antioch in A.D. 53. In the same year he starts on his third and last mission (53-57). He visits Ephesus, Macedonia, and Greece, and is on the point of departing directly for Antioch when he decides on the land journey through Macedonia, and there the mysterious *we* reappears, as if he had been residing in Macedonia since his first disappearance. He now accompanies the Apostle, step by step, to Troas, Mitylene, Miletus (XX. 5-15), then to Cos, Rhodes, Patara, from thence to Tyre, Cæsarea, and up

[1] *Luke the Physician*, p. 3 (2).

to the arrival at Jerusalem (XXI. 1-18). Again *we* disappears from the narrative of Paul's stay in Jerusalem. Paul is cast into prison, conducted to Cæsarea and kept in prison there for two years, from A.D. 57-59. Having made an appeal to the Imperial tribunal, he is about to set out with an escort for Rome, when the *we* comes on the scene, and the later chapters of the Acts are the account of Paul's voyage from Cæsarea to Rome (XXVII. 1 - XXVIII. 16). They are written by a companion of the sea journey, the shipwreck, the wintering at Malta, and the arrival at Rome, with such exact details that they constitute a journal compelling our belief in its veracity. Then once more *we* disappears, and the Acts end in the third person, reporting that Paul remained two whole years at Rome, in the house which he had hired, receiving those who came to visit him and preaching to all the kingdom of God (XXVII. 17-31). The trial of Paul before Cæsar, which we have been looking forward to since they set out from Cæsarea, as the issue of the long passion of the Apostle, is not recounted in the Acts.

This mysterious *we* who accompanies Paul from Troas to Philippi in A.D. 50, from Macedonia to Jerusalem in 57, and from Cæsarea to Rome, is no other than the very author of the Acts of the Apostles, to whom the *we* serves as a signature. You can well imagine that the critics who systematically insist that the composition of the Acts should be referred to as late a date as A.D. 105, rebel against this identification, which they describe as "romantic." Harnack, however, does not hesitate to take it up again, to examine

it from all points of view, and to come to the conclusion that it is absolutely justified. "If we read the Acts of the Apostles guided by the ruling fashion of literary criticism, we may analyse it into some half-dozen separate strata of documents, but if we read with discernment, we discover *one mind* and *one hand*. . . . In this work of art—for the Acts of the Apostles is nothing less; it is, indeed, a literary performance of the first rank, in construction no less than in style—he has produced something quite unique and lasting . . . we really have here a man of the first Greek generation in the history of Christianity." [1]

Harnack has another merit, which is to have taken up again on his own account an ingenious and subtle argument, which seemed to have gone out of fashion, and which consists in submitting to a careful examination the vocabulary of the third Gospel and the Acts, to try and find traces of technical knowledge. He arrives at the conclusion that the writer, who speaks of *we* in the second part of the Acts, is a physician. When shipwrecked at Malta, Paul and his companions were received by a man of note named Publius, whose father was sick. Paul cures

[1] *Luke the Physician*, p. 143 (102). *Orpheus*, p. 234 (344), still holds the opinion that the unknown compiler has made use of an "apparently authentic journal of Luke's," which is recognizable by the use of the *we*. Reinach has not taken Harnack into account. The identity of the person who uses the *we* with the author of the Acts, is dealt with also by V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Vol. II (Cambridge, 1909), pp. 242, 312, where it receives its full value. For a view of the inextricable confusion into which the contrary theory becomes involved, see Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 445 (405).

him by the imposition of hands; but before this occurs the author gives the name of the malady: fever and dysentery, *πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίῳ*, which are both technical terms. Immediately after the shipwreck, Paul and his companions are warming themselves at a great fire, when a viper springs out of the blazing brush-wood and fastens (*καθῆψεν*) itself on Paul's hand. The Apostle shakes off the animal into the fire, but the natives who stand round "expect to see him swell up (*πίμπρασθαι*), or suddenly fall dead (*καταπίπτειν*)," but Paul remains unhurt. It has been shown that *καθάπτειν* (which signifies a poisonous bite) is a technical term, as also are *πίμπρασθαι* and *καταπίπτειν*. These terms would not deserve our attention, but that we come across analogous words, with striking frequency, in those chapters of the Acts where the *we* is absent, and also in the third Gospel. We soon receive the impression that whenever the writer wishes to mention a detail which touches on his medical experience, he knows how to express it with professional accuracy. We will cite one more example: Paul calls down the curse of God on the false Jewish prophet, Elymas: "The hand of the Lord is upon thee, thou shalt be blind and for a time thou shalt not see the light." The curse is effective. "Immediately there fell a mist and darkness upon him (*παραχρῆμα ἔπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀχλὺς καὶ σκότος*), and groping he sought for some one who would take him by the hand" (*Acts* XIII. 11). The word *ἀχλύς*, mist, is a medical term to designate a cloudiness which develops in the pupil of the eye and which is compared by Galen to atmospheric mist.

Harnack accumulates ingenious observations of this kind, arriving at the conclusion that the vocabulary is that of a medical writer.

We have then established, by a remarkable series of convergent evidence, the identity of Luke, the beloved physician, with the author of the Acts. Harnack shows that Luke is, in his own manner, whatever may be urged to the contrary, a disciple of St. Paul. We do not discover in the Acts a single quotation from the Epistles of Paul which we possess (and this is a good proof of the primitive date of the Acts); and yet the character which Luke gives to Paul, in the three great discourses he ascribes to him, corresponds with the character revealed in the Epistles. We, who have the Epistles in our hands, cannot imagine that Paul would have spoken otherwise than Luke makes him speak. "The author of the Acts of the Apostles not a disciple of the Apostle? Who, I ask, except one who knew St. Paul personally, could portray him as he appears in this book? Was it possible for an admirer of the Apostle at the beginning of the second century to give so concrete a narrative and to avoid eulogy to such a degree? Even if no *we* appeared in the whole book, it would scarcely admit of doubt that the author—so far as concerns the history of St. Paul's missionary work from chapter XIII. to the conclusion—wrote on the authority of an eye-witness with whom he was a contemporary." [1]

[1] *Luke the Physician*, p. 139 (99). As to the *Paulinism* of Luke, see *ibid.* p. 142 (101). It is very true that the Acts ignore the Epistles of Paul, but this is itself a proof that the Acts were

III.

The date at which Luke wrote the Acts can have been very little earlier than Paul's acquittal before the tribunal of Cæsar, since he recounts the two years' detention of Paul in Rome without mentioning the trial.[1]

Harnack appears to have hesitated a long time before he accepted this opinion (which is St. Jerome's), although the evidence is quite clear. In 1906 he placed the work of composition by Luke at Ephesus (if not in Achaia) about the year A.D. 80. In 1908 he is no longer afraid to say: "Luke wrote in the time of Titus (79-81), or in the first years of Vespasian (69-70), but perhaps even at the beginning of the sixties."[2]

In fact, there is not a word in the course of the Acts which hints at the death of Peter or Paul. In the third Gospel, which is earlier than the Acts, it does not appear clearly that Jerusalem was destroyed; now, if Luke had written after A.D. 70, would he not have pointed out to us that Christ's prophecy over Jerusalem had been fulfilled to the letter? And

not composed at a late date, when these Epistles were read on all sides. This in contradiction to *Orpheus*, p. 234 (344).

[1] Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 24 (18), mentions the hypothesis of Krenkel, according to which the Acts were founded on Josephus, and calls it an hypothesis in the air. *Orpheus*, p. 221 (325), makes this exploded theory his own, and insists that "*Our* Luke attests a knowledge of Josephus' Antiquities, published A.D. 93, or at least of some Greek source drawn upon in that book." For a discussion of this theory, see Jacquier, Vol. III. p. 101; Stanton, Vol. II, p. 263.

[2] *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1908), p. 221.

would he not have separated this prophecy from that referring to the end of all things, instead of seeming to confound them together?[1] Nowhere does the Christian name appear to meet with hostility from the Roman magistrates; we can see this from the action of the Strategoi at Philippi (xvi. 35-9); of the Proconsul of Achaia at Corinth (xviii. 12-17); of the two Procurators of Judea, Felix and Festus (xxiv. 22-7; xxv. 1-5). It would have been very different after the Neronic persecution had broken out. This consideration is not from Harnack, but it can be added to those he has developed. Harnack finally observes that in no passage of the Acts do the Jews play the part of the oppressed, on the contrary, they are the *beati possidentes*, agitating and arrogant, both in Jerusalem and in the Dispersion; and Luke has not a single phrase to suggest that the end of this tranquillity is drawing nigh.[2]

The Acts are, therefore, the work of a companion of the Apostle Paul, and all probabilities fix the date of its production at A.D. 62.

The work is neither more nor less than a narrative of the events from the return of Christ to his Father, up to the moment when Paul arrived in Rome for his trial. There seems an excessive disproportion between the two terms. On the one side, the Ascension and Pentecost; on the other, Paul arriving in Rome under custody of a soldier, and installing himself in a house which he has hired. I am afraid that critics give Luke an altogether undue ambition, when

[1] *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1908), p. 220.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 219; Blass, p. 3.

they represent him as undertaking to write the Acts as the history of the expansion of the Gospel under the impulse of the Spirit, from Jerusalem to the surrounding country and to all Judea, then to the Greeks, and finally to Rome; as if he held Rome to be the antithesis of Jerusalem, and as if the expansion of the Gospel and the action of the Spirit were personified in Paul. The refined and ingenuous artist in Luke did not conceive such a dramatic plot. He wrote, so to speak, as a private individual, a narrative which he dedicated to his friend Theophilus; and he had no other object in view except to give information to this friend. Paul's Roman friends, with Theophilus at their head, wished to know, not only the history of Jesus, but also the past Apostolic work of Paul; how his Apostolate was connected with that of Peter and the Twelve; how it was connected with Jesus; and how the Spirit had co-operated in that work which was the diffusion of the Gospel, the preaching of the kingdom and of all that concerned the Lord Jesus Christ. This, we conceive, was the thread that bound together the narratives in the Acts and caused them to cease with the arrival of Paul at Rome.[1]

[1] All this is in opposition to Harnack, *op. cit.* p. 12. By this also we reject the hypothesis that Luke had the design of writing a third book as a sequel to the Acts. We set aside the conjecture that Theophilus was a pagan whom Luke sought to enlighten on the character of Christianity. Theophilus, who is given the title of κράτιστος (I. 3), may have been of the same rank as Felix (XXIII. 26), or Festus (XXVI. 25), who are addressed in the same style. Luke does not address him as "Brother." This is one of those touches of delicate tact of which Luke was a better

As soon as we have established that Luke is the author of the Acts, there no longer remains any question as to sources for the second half of that book. It is the narrative of an eye-witness, who, for everything that did not take place under his own eyes, has only to ask his missionary companions, beginning with Paul himself. Thus from the commencement of the second missionary journey to his arrival in Rome, Luke has no need of written documents, unless it be his own personal notes. He is a direct witness, and the exact sobriety which characterizes his manner in this portion has been justly appreciated.

For the first half of the Acts it was otherwise. It recounts the history of the years A.D. 30-50, the first twenty years of Christendom, to which Luke was a stranger. Still no one can believe that Luke imagined the events of that time, any more than the events recorded in the third Gospel.

Harnack is not the only scholar who has endeavoured to distinguish the underlying documents in the first half of the Acts; but he has done it with discretion, realizing that such an investigation of sources, however reasonable in principle, is difficult to push far in this case with any accuracy. He finds that there are some accounts which are narrated from the standpoint of those who lived in Jerusalem and Cæsarea, others from Jerusalem and Antioch, and others again from Jerusalem alone. . . .[1] I shall not

judge than we can be. This against J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des N.T.* Vol. I (Göttingen, 1907), p. 409.

[1] *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 133.

insist on these views, as they would occupy too much time and need too minute an attention, and, besides, the certainty you would obtain in the end would be very little. I only beg you to retain the impression that the great artistic feeling of Luke has enabled him to preserve, from the records he has put together (whether written or oral we cannot say), the character proper to each, something of the mentality of the diverse Christian communities from whom he received them.

You must then reflect that Luke, whatever may have been his origin before he was a Christian, laboured by the side of Paul at Rome with Mark; that "John surnamed Mark," who is so frequently and so vividly brought before us in the Acts.[1] Luke was with Paul at Cæsarea in A.D. 57 when they abode "at the house of Philip, the evangelist, who was one of the seven" (XXI. 8); some days after this they lodged "with one named Mnason, from the island of Cyprus, an old disciple," i.e. one of those converted at the first hour; it was at this time also that Luke, with Paul, went to visit James "the brother of the Lord," where all the priests of the community at Jerusalem were gathered together. We might really ask how Luke could have managed *not* to learn anything from Christians like Mnason, and still more like Philip "the evangelist, who was one of the seven," or Mark, the

[1] See especially *Acts* XII. 12-17. Renan, *Les Apôtres*, p. 249, says on this passage: "The story in the Acts is so vivid and apposite, that it is difficult to find room for any prolonged legendary elaboration."

cousin of Barnabas and the author of the second Gospel.[1]

We are driven to the conclusion that Luke wrote his history of the first twenty years of Christendom in accordance with what he had learned directly from the witnesses of those events.[2]

IV.

We are now in a position to pursue our inquiry as to what is related about the life of Christ by the ministers of the Word, whom Luke makes to speak in the Acts. The points which we shall consider are drawn from the discourses which Luke puts into the mouths of Peter and Paul.

First with regard to those of St. Paul.[3] The

[1] *Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 132. Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 450 (411), usually so hostile to the Acts, acknowledges that the "unknown writer utilized documents . . . one in which Jerusalemic material preponderated, as well as the journal originating in the Pauline circle (the 'We' section)."

[2] Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 119 (84), hesitates between two hypotheses; according to the first, Luke used an account which he translated from the Aramaic; according to the second, he only gathered oral traditions. There are, says Harnack, weighty reasons in favour of the former, but it is impossible to disprove the latter. R. Knopf, in J. Weiss, *Schriften des N.T.* Vol. I (Göttingen, 1907), p. 527, considers it indubitable that the Acts, as also the third Gospel, were written from previous documents, although it would be hazardous for a critic to indicate these documents, except in a few cases besides the *we* sections.

[3] See also the discourse addressed by Paul to the pagans at Lystra (*Acts* xiv. 15-17), which is a specimen of his preaching with the object of converting to the true God those pagans who believed in Jupiter and Mercury.

Apostle arrives at Athens in the course of the year A.D. 50. He first disputes in the synagogue with the "Jews and men fearing God," i.e. Greeks converted to belief in the true God and to the moral code of the Jews—a floating clientèle of the synagogues of the Dispersion. Then Paul goes to the Agora, where he meets philosophers, Epicureans and Stoics (observe the accuracy with which Luke distinguishes the two schools); and these philosophers, hearing him preach "Jesus and the Resurrection," say to one another: "It seemeth that he preacheth of strange gods" (XVII. 18). From the beginning Paul insists on the Gospel as a fact: Jesus and the Resurrection.

The Athenians wish Paul to explain himself; they lead him to the Areopagus, where Paul gives the discourse which Luke reports, and which is a marvel of elegance and persuasiveness. But all his Attic grace does not make Paul vary from his accustomed conclusion:—

> God, not taking into account these times of ignorance, now announceth to men that they should in all places do penance; for He hath appointed a day on which He will judge the world according to justice, by the man whom He hath chosen and accredited before us, raising Him from the dead (XVII. 30-31).

In reporting the words addressed by Paul to these educated Athenians, so filled with curiosity, Luke has set forth clearly the inner logical thought of the Apostle: we must pass from ignorance to the knowledge of the true God, then to a moral conversion, in view of the day of God and His Justice, which is near at hand, and whose minister is the man whom God has

accredited by raising Him from the dead. Paul founds faith in Christ on the fact of His Resurrection.

The discourse pronounced in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia is a very different type of oratory, for Paul is not now addressing pagans, but a congregation of Jews and of Greeks who have been converted to a belief in God, and to the moral system of the Jews, the "God-fearing." Paul can therefore appeal to the testimony of the prophets of the Old Testament, and to the ancient history of salvation. Israel, he says, was the people chosen by God, and in this people God raised up David :—

> Of his posterity God, according to His promise, hath made to come forth for Israel a Saviour, Jesus. Before His coming, John had preached a baptism of penance to all the people of Israel, and arriving at the end of his course he said : I am not He whom you think, but behold there cometh after me one the latchet of whose shoe I am unworthy to loose.
>
> My brethren, sons of the race of Israel, and you who fear God, it is to you that this word of salvation is sent. For the inhabitants of Jerusalem and their rulers, not having known Jesus and the oracles of the prophets which are read every Sabbath, have fulfilled them by their judgment, and without having found anything in Him worthy of death. They demanded of Pilate to have Him put to death. And when they had accomplished all things that were written of Him, they took Him down from the cross and laid Him in a sepulchre. But God hath raised Him from the dead ; and during many consecutive days He showed Himself to those who had come up with Him from Galilee to Jerusalem, and who are now His witnesses before the people (XIII. 23-31).

The reasons for believing in Christ are two : *First*, a consideration of fact : Jesus was condemned to death at Jerusalem by the Sanhedrin without their

having found anything in Him worthy of death, and they demanded from Pilate to have Him put to death; He died on the cross, He was buried, and He rose again and showed Himself living for many consecutive days to His disciples whom He had brought up from Galilee to Jerusalem, and who attest that they have seen Him. *Secondly*, an argument from prophecy: Jesus is the Saviour promised to Israel, and in Him are accomplished the oracles of the prophets, and all that is written of Him in the Scripture.

If we compare these two discourses, we realize that of the two considerations, one is subordinate to the other. The fact of the Resurrection is that which generates the faith both for Jew and Greek. To this fundamental fact there is superimposed, for the Jew, the argument drawn from the prophecies fulfilled in the history of the Saviour. Prophecy has not suggested the fact to the imagination of the first disciples, but they recognized that the facts had been prefigured in prophecy. The argument which Luke ascribes to Paul would have no force as a proof, unless the facts were admitted before he could appeal to the prophecies which foretold them.

The Acts give us several discourses of Peter; and we shall be able to obtain from them the statements of that Apostle on the history of Jesus.

1. When the Apostles were about to choose one of their companions of the first hour, Matthias, to take the place of Judas Iscariot, Peter addressed them in these words:—

It is necessary that, from among these men who have accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus was with us, from the baptism of John to the day when He was taken up from amongst us, one should with us become a witness of His Resurrection (I. 21-22).

2. To the Jews, whom the miracle of Pentecost filled with astonishment, Peter makes the following speech:—

Children of Israel, listen. Jesus of Nazareth, that man to whom God hath given testimony for you by prodigies, miracles, and signs which He did by Him in the midst of you, as you yourselves know; this man being delivered unto you . . . you have fixed to the cross and put to death by the hands of wicked men; and God hath raised Him up (II. 22-24).

Continuing his discourse, Peter announces that the Resurrection of Christ was prophesied by

David, whose sepulchre[1] exists among us to this day (II. 29).

And he concludes:—

This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. . . . Let all the house of Israel know that God hath made Lord and Christ this Jesus whom you crucified (II. 32-36).

As in the discourses of Paul, we have here an argument from fact and testimony, and to confirm and explain this fact, an argument from prophecy.

3. Peter and John healed a lame man at the gate of the Temple: "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, arise and walk" (III. 6). The people are

[1] This monument, on Mt. Ophel, to the south of the city and near Siloe, disappeared in the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Josephus who had seen it standing, speaks of it several times; Schürer, Vol. I, p. 270 (260). We have here another indication that the composition of the Acts is earlier than A.D. 70.

astounded and admire the power of Peter and John, but these protest:—

> The God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers hath glorified His servant Jesus, whom you delivered up and denied before Pilate, who was of advice that He should be released. . . . You demanded favour for a murderer. You put to death the Prince of life whom God hath raised from the dead, of which we are witnesses (III. 13-15).

Peter then applies the argument from prophecy:—

> God hath accomplished what He had announced before by the mouth of all His prophets, that His Christ should suffer . . . (III. 17-18).

If we examine all the discourses which make up Peter's preaching to the Jews of Jerusalem in the first five chapters of the Acts, we shall see that each time he comes back to the affirmation that Jesus of Nazareth was crucified, that He was raised from the dead, and that He is the Christ of prophecy.

4. We now come to a discourse addressed by Peter, not to Jews, but to a pagan converted to the fear of God and Jewish morals. Peter had left Jerusalem for Cæsarea, and was in the house of the centurion, Cornelius, who had gathered together his friends and neighbours to hear him; and he gives them a brief summary of the Gospel:—

> You know what hath happened in all Judæa, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached: how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went from place to place, doing good and curing all those who were under the empire of the devil, for God was with Him. As for us, we are witnesses of all that He did in the country of the Jews and in Jerusalem. Then they put Him to

death, hanging Him from the tree. But God raised Him up on the third day, and gave Him to be seen, not by all the people, but by witnesses chosen long beforehand by God, by us who have eaten and drunk with Him after His Resurrection from the dead. And Jesus ordained us to preach to the people and to affirm that it is He who hath been established by God judge of the living and the dead. All the prophets give testimony that whosoever believeth in Him receiveth through His name the pardon of their sins (x. 37-43).

This short discourse of Peter will recall to your minds the passage which I cited from the first Epistle to the Corinthians (xv. 1-9), as a specimen of Paul's catechesis. It shows the terms in which a Christian missionary of the first generation presented the Gospel to a Greek already converted to monotheism and Old Testament ethics, such as the centurion, Cornelius, "a just man and fearing God" (x. 22). The chief element in the Gospel is the history of Jesus of Nazareth; it opens in Galilee, after John had preached his baptism. The Spirit has anointed Jesus; and He has worked miraculous cures, because God was with Him; and Peter is a witness of all these things. Jesus was crucified at Jerusalem; He died and rose again on the third day; He will come to judge the living and the dead. Do you observe the coincidence of this summary with the broad outlines of our "Apostles' Creed," which is a catechism reduced to its shortest expression? Observe also how the prophetic argument is only enunciated at the end, as if it were a subsidiary consideration. The essential point is that Jesus of Nazareth exercised, by His miracles, a prerogative of God; that when dead He rose again; and that those who ate and drank with

Him after His rising again, attest the truth of this Resurrection and of His miracles.

Luke, the beloved physician of Paul, conveyed these discourses of Peter and Paul to Theophilus in A.D. 62. One more doubt may be proposed, and I should not be honest if I did not take it into consideration. Is it not possible that these discourses, ascribed by Luke to Peter and Paul, may be merely ingenious fictions of Luke, in the style of those speeches given by ancient historians, whose *concliones* impress us so much by their eloquence?[1]

Such an analogy from classical authors is not applicable to a writer of the character of Luke. He has an ingenuousness, or rather a scrupulosity for the truth, which would have forbidden him the use of such an artifice. The proof lies in an observation we have already made, that not only does he not make Peter speak like Paul, but the language which he puts into the mouth, whether of Peter or Paul, has so marked an individuality, that the hypothesis of an imitation becomes highly improbable, even if we grant to Luke an extreme versatility of composition. I cannot here enter into the examination of this individuality both for Peter and Paul, but it has been investigated to the smallest detail.[2] No doubt Luke only gives short summaries, still when we are dealing with Paul we find familiar expressions or favourite words of Paul; we find his usual train of thought, and, as it were, reminiscences of the Epistles,

[1] Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 443 (404).

[2] Prat, pp. 14-15, 81; Jacquier, Vol. III, p. 159.

which however are never used in the Acts.[1] If Peter is being reported, we are struck by the archaic style of his Christian language: Jesus is there called "Jesus Christ of Nazareth," the "Nazarene," a completely Jewish expression which later Christian language has not retained. Nor has it preserved such phrases as the following: Four times Jesus is termed, not the Son, but the Child (*παῖς*) of God; Peter says that "God has raised Him up by His right hand to be Prince (*ἀρχηγόν*) and Saviour," *Prince* in the sense of Divinely appointed chief or King of Israel. Finally we do not employ such assertions as: "God hath made Lord and Christ this Jesus whom you crucified,"[2] nor, "God was with Him."

Harnack comes to the same conclusion as ourselves. The discourse at Miletus, he says, is an address which Luke heard, and which made such a deep impression on him that he recollected it, and we can affirm that the summary he gives is authentic, "in that sense in which a summary can be called authentic." It has long been acknowledged that in the whole of the Acts there is no portion which in "spirit and vocabulary comes nearer to the Epistles of Paul than this passage." As for the other discourses, "it is difficult to believe that they were mere fictions; for, if they were, the imagination of the author who could create them with so astonishing a fitness would be extraordinary." Harnack thinks that Luke has obtained

[1] Jülicher, p. 450 (408).

[2] J. Lebreton, *Origines du Dogme de la Trinité* (Paris, 1910), p. 263 *et seq.*

the discourses he gives us in the Acts from written sources—several written sources.[1]

You see then, gentlemen, that an examination of the Acts of the Apostles leads us to the same result as we had already obtained from a study of St. Paul's Epistles. I pointed out to you a week ago, that Paul had learned to know the historic Christ, thanks to the Christians of the first hour, such as Stephen, Barnabas, Ananias, and Peter himself. Luke, the companion of Paul, in composing the Acts, was not content with listening to Paul and reproducing him, but obtained information from those who were already old Christians, whom he met, probably at Antioch; certainly Philip, the "evangelist," at Cæsarea; the "old disciple" Mnason, his host in Jerusalem; and Mark, in an especial manner an old disciple and Luke's own companion at Rome. The sources from which he drew what he knows of the preaching of Peter furnish us with points of such an archaic style, that we truly find in them the most primitive Christian words about Jesus.[2]

[1] *Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 109.

[2] You can now appreciate how much prejudice there is in an assertion like the following from Salomon Reinach: "If (Paul's) Epistles did not exist . . . it would hardly be a paradox to doubt the historic reality of Jesus," *Orpheus*, p. 231 (339). On this point, without knowing it, Reinach falls into line with A. Drews' book, *Die Christusmythe* (Jena, 1910), which has just caused such a lively controversy in Germany. This last has been summarized by C. Fillion: "La lutte pour l'éxistence du Christ," in the *Revue du clergé française*, Vol. LXIV (1910), p. 420. The result is that in my present lecture I am

dealing with exactly the same subject as Johann Weiss in his book, *Jesus von Nazareth, Mythus oder Geschichte, eine Auseinandersetzung mit Kalthoff, Drews, Jensen* (Tübingen, 1910). From the numerous points of agreement between Weiss and myself it is easy to see that there is an indisputable neutral ground of history unassailable by the paradoxes of those who build on their own self-sufficiency.

THE GOSPELS.

(10 April, 1910.)

Gentlemen,

In our last lecture, as you will perhaps remember, we arrived at a twofold result of great importance. This was to identify the author of the Acts as St. Luke, the physician and companion of St. Paul; and at the same time to determine the date of his composing the Acts as the year A.D. 62 at Rome. The brief study we made of the Acts will have given you some idea of the very cautious good sense (as a theologian, this is the least I can say) which the beloved physician employs in his method of narration. He never speaks from imagination, but he observes, notes, and selects. If he cannot obtain reliable details about some event—such as the death of James (the Greater), the brother of John[1]—he states the fact in a single word and passes on. We have no right to suppose that he acted otherwise when he composed his first book for Theophilus, our Gospel according to St. Luke.

I.

The number of Catholic exegetists who admit that Luke employed Mark's Gospel as a basis for his own

[1] Harnack, *Apostelgesch.* p. 106.

is growing steadily. We shall take it as generally accepted.[1]

The inspiration of a sacred writer does not exempt him from the duty of seeking information, and this may be obtained from sources that are quite free from any inspiration themselves. That a writer is inspired only secures that his work shall be free from error by the assistance of God, and that it shall tell the truth by command of God.[2] We know that the inspired author of the second book of Machabees has merely summarized in one book what Jason of Cyrene, a Jewish historian, had composed in five. This biblical precedent throws light, if it be needed, on the case of Luke, although there is no strict analogy, since the chief source of Luke is itself an inspired work.

[1] L. de Grandmaison, *Revue biblique*, 1907, p. 438. The way for the critical solution of the "synoptical question" was opened to Catholic exegetists by Lagrange, *Revue biblique*, 1895, p. 5; 1896 p. 5, in two articles on "Les sources du troisième Évangile." Cornely, *Introductio specialis in N.T.* (Parisiis, 1886), p. 184; represents earlier teaching. For the course of events since that time, see A. Camerlynck and H. Coppieters, *Synopsis* (Brugis, 1908), p. xxi. Camerlynck is a professor at the Grand Séminaire of Bruges, Coppieters at the University of Louvain. As to the state of the question, from a more general point of view, see Stanton, Vol. II, p. 8. And for the answer proposed by actually prevalent criticism, Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 338 (297). The statements of *Orpheus* on the synoptical question are mainly taken from Schmiedel, art. "Gospels," in the *Encyclopœdia Biblica* of Cheyne, a kind of exegetical Larousse which created some scandal in England a few years ago.

[2] C. Pesch, *De Inspiratione S.S.* (Friburgi, 1906), p. 430.

Luke informs us, in the prologue at the head of his Gospel, that he has consulted the compositions already existing on the Gospel.

> Since many have undertaken to compose a relation of the things which have been accomplished amongst us, according as those have transmitted to us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and who have been ministers of the Word, I have thought well, myself also, to revise all with care and to write them in order for thee, Excellent Theophilus, so that thou mayest recognize the certainty of the things in which thou hast been instructed (*Luke* I. 1-4).

We must weigh the words of this fine classical passage, which in its general design is believed to be taken from the prologue which Dioscorides puts at the head of his treatise *De Materia Medica*.

Theophilus, for whom Luke is writing his Gospel, is already instructed in the elements of Christianity.[1] Luke desires to give him an account in which things are presented in the order in which they occurred, for he is giving an historical narrative. The things told are to be those which have been "accomplished amongst us." I prefer this translation, which we find in the Vulgate, to the one which implies that Luke wished to say: Those things which are "established amongst us," i.e. known with entire certainty.[2]

[1] We must not exaggerate the meaning of words. The verb κατηχεῖν does not here bear the technical meaning of "catechesis," but signifies merely the conveyance of information or instruction. In *Acts* XXI. 24, Luke applies it to false reports: "All will know that what they have heard say (κατήχηνται) about thee is false."

[2] So also Blass, *Philology of the Gospels* (London, 1898), p. 12. A. Loisy, *Synoptiques*, Vol. I, p. 270; and J. Weiss,

In saying "amongst us," Luke is ranking himself with the generation of contemporaries of the accomplished events. Still he separates himself from the actual eye-witnesses, since he only knows these things "according as those have transmitted to us (*παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν*), who from the beginning," that is from the baptism of John, "were eye-witnesses (*οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται*), and who have since been ministers of the Word." Luke is here indicating the testimony and ministry of the Apostles. He shows also that the Apostles have not themselves written an account of the events (he did not therefore know the Gospel bearing the name of Matthew, still less that of John), for he distinguishes the catechesis, or oral instruction of the ministers of the Word, from the attempts at written narratives, and he sets them against one another, as two separate ministries. Before Luke then, and earlier than the year A.D. 62, others than the Apostles had written what the Apostles testified, others, who are called *many* (*πολλοί*) in the sense of *several*.[1] Luke adds: "I have thought well, myself also. . . ." He looks upon himself as being in the same position as the authors of the earlier essays; he has therefore received, at the same time as these others, the things that were transmitted

Schriften, Vol. I, p. 410. *Orpheus*, p. 219 (323), translates: "those things which are most surely believed among us," a mistranslation with a "tendency," which would afterwards allow the insinuation that Luke was not of the first Christian generation. This mistranslation is, however, not an original one of Reinach's.

[1] Jülicher, p. 368 (324).

by the eye-witnesses who are ministers of the Word (*παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν*). He does not say that he will not take into account what has been already written; on the contrary, we find him drawing from previous writings. The apparent contradiction can be reconciled, if these previous narratives in some way form one body of teaching with that of the Apostles; in other words, if Luke knew that they were in perfect conformity with the testimony of the witnesses whose authority he claims.[1]

II.

The preaching of Christ by the ministers of the Word had for its primary subject what those witnesses knew of Christ, His life and His teaching. We need only recall the discourses already quoted from the Acts, as delivered by Peter. These discourses give us a vivid impression of the Apostle's manner of preaching, namely, a statement of his testimony as an eye-witness. It is very significant of the scrupulous care with which he spoke as a witness, that the recital is strictly limited to what the witnesses actually had under their own observation, namely, the public ministry of Christ, beginning with the baptism of Christ in the Jordan, and ending with "the day on which He was taken away from the midst of us" (*Acts* I. 21-2). Luke, in his Gospel, has not kept to this narrow limitation; he goes beyond it, not only in so far as the Acts are, as it were, a continuation of the Gospel, but also because

[1] Stanton, Vol. II, p. 274.

he goes further back, to the time before John's baptism. He begins at the beginning by giving a genealogy of Jesus (III. 23-38), and also by giving what he has learned of the infancy of Jesus and of John: the Annunciation, the virginal Conception, the Nativity at Bethlehem, the Presentation in the Temple, and the story of Jesus at the age of twelve years amongst the doctors (I. 5-II. 52). St. Matthew also gives us something on the infancy of Christ; Mark, on the contrary, by following the limitation prescribed in the Acts, shows a relative archaism.[1]

Another archaic character in Mark is his persistence in recounting miraculous events. It has been aptly said that his could be called the Gospel of the miracles of the Lord. He does not altogether neglect the words of Christ, although he has left so much to be collected by Luke and Matthew; and it is Mark again who notes, soon after the first discourse in the

[1] The Gospel of St. Mark (abstracting from XVI. 9-20, which is *canonical*, but not part of the original) is earlier than St. Luke, but we cannot assign any more precise date. Critics believe that Mark's Gospel has passed through several progressive stages of completion. If, in fact, we grant that Luke and Matthew employed Mark, it becomes very remarkable that so many portions are wanting, from either one or the other. Mark must have given his work an "editorial revision" during his own life (Stanton, Vol. II, p. 152). *Orpheus*, p. 221 (325), decides in four lines: (1) "The writer of our Mark was acquainted with Matthew and even with Luke;" (2) that the proto-Mark was in Aramaic; (3) that the deutero-Mark knew Q—hypotheses (of Schmiedel) which no one now considers worthy of study. See Loisy, *Synoptiques*, Vol. I, p. 78; and F. Nicolardot, *Les procédés de rédaction des trois 1ers évangélistes* (Paris, 1908), p. viii.

synagogue at Capharnaum, that those who heard Him were "astonished at His doctrine," for He did not teach "as the scribes" (I. 22). On this same day and in this same synagogue the discourse is interrupted by a possessed person crying out: "What is there between us and thee, Jesus of Nazareth? Thou art come to destroy us. I know who Thou art, the Holy one of God." And Jesus, addressing the spirit which was troubling the man, said with a threat: "Go out of that man." The impure spirit goes out uttering a great cry. Mark adds that the spectators of this scene are astounded and say to one another: "He commands even the impure spirits as a master, and they obey Him. And His fame was spread abroad through all the neighbouring country of Galilee" (I. 23-28).

Observe the interest which Mark attaches to this power of Jesus over the "impure spirits." From the first day of His Galilean ministry, Jesus is set before us in the position of a prophet who has power over the devils. Then appear the sick who are brought to Jesus with the demoniacs; the mother-in-law of Peter, cured of a fever (I. 29-30), and later the paralytic of Capharnaum (II. 1-12). I also beg you to notice the extraordinary vividness of the following scene, and you will realize Mark's gift for painting a crowd:—

And Jesus with His disciples withdrew towards the sea,[1] and a great crowd followed Him; people of Galilee, people of Judæa,

[1] Mark (and Matthew) call "sea" or "Sea of Galilee" what Luke calls "lake" or "Lake of Gennezareth." This is an indication of the difference of mental horizon in the Evangelists.

people of Jerusalem, people of Idumea and beyond the Jordan, people from the coast of Tyre and Sidon, a great crowd. They had heard of all that Jesus did, and they came to see Him. And He told His disciples to have ready a boat because of the crowd, that they might not be crushed, for He healed many people, and all those who had any sickness cast themselves upon Him to touch Him. And the impure spirits, seeing Him, threw themselves upon the earth before Him, and cried out, saying : Thou art the son of God. And He commanded them strongly that they should not make Him known (III. 7-12).[1]

Luke and Matthew repeat these things, but they have, as it were, broken up the visual image which Mark had. We might continue, and we should go from miracle to miracle; the stilling of the tempest (IV. 35-40); the raising to life of the daughter of Jairus (V. 21-24, 35-43); the multiplication of the loaves (VI. 33-44); the cure of the daughter of the Canaanite woman (VII. 24-30); the deaf-mute of the Decapolis (VII. 31-37); the blind man of Bethsaida (VIII. 22-26); the other blind man of Jericho (X. 46-52). . . . My list is incomplete, but it is already sufficiently long to show how Mark presents the Galilean ministry of Jesus. The feeling aroused in Galilee is due to the miracles which multiplied beneath His steps. Now we must again go back to the discourses of Peter in the Acts. The aim of the most primitive teaching is to prove that Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ. "Jesus of Nazareth" is there-

[1] As to the silence which the Saviour, according to Mark, imposes about His being described as the Messiah, see Lagrange in the *Revue biblique*, 1903, p. 625, where he criticizes W. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (Göttingen, 1901).

fore presented to us as "the man to whom God hath given testimony by prodigies, miracles, and signs which He did by Him;" as He who "went from place to place, doing good and healing all those who were under the empire of the devil, for God was with Him" (*Acts* II. 22; x. 38).[1] Mark's idea agrees with that ascribed by Luke to Peter.

In the first half of the second century it was still remembered that Mark, who had neither heard nor accompanied Jesus, was the companion of Peter, and had served as his *interpreter;* "Mark," said the *Presbyter* to Papias, "who was the interpreter of Peter, wrote exactly, although without order, all that he remembered of the words or acts of the Lord. . . . He had only one care, to omit nothing that he had heard, and to say nothing that was false."[2] This

[1] Wernle, *Sources*, p. 105 (56): "What above all gives value to the Gospel of Mark, is that it makes known to us the thoughts of the most primitive Christians in their pre-Pauline period." So also Jülicher, p. 321 (278). J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (Berlin, 1905), p. 52.

[2] This extract from Papias is given in Eusebius, *H.E.* III. 29, 15. From the context, it is supposed (by Harnack, Funk, *et al.*) that the Presbyter (or Ancient) seen by Papias was the "Presbyter John." Papias wrote about A.D. 140-150; the Presbyter John might be the Apostle (Funk), or another John contemporary with the Apostle (Harnack). The word "interpreter" does not imply that Mark helped Peter to make himself understood by those who spoke Greek, nor that he translated the discourses into Greek, but that he wrote down what Peter said (Funk). Schleiermacher, in 1832, supposed that, as the Gospel described by the Presbyter was without order (*ἀκριβῶς ὀυ μέντοι τάξει*), it could not refer to our Gospel of Mark, but to some other now lost. This opinion is not thought worthy

Presbyter lived in the third Christian generation and probably knew the second. He knew then that Mark had drawn up his Gospel under the authority of the Apostle Peter. There is nothing fabulous about this tale. Johann Weiss insists on the remarkable justification given to it by a critical examination of Mark's Gospel. In the story of the Passion, out of seventy-two verses in chapter XIV., twenty-two refer to incidents in which Peter was concerned, including the account of his sleepiness at Gethsemane and of his subsequent denial; good evidence, says Weiss, that there is a *substratum* of Peter's narrative, since the events are described from his point of view, and in proportion as he was concerned in them. Who, in fact, except Peter himself, would have wished to give the account of his denial? We must say the same of the incident at Cæsarea Philippi (*Mark* VIII. 27-33), where Peter shows himself so shocked at the prophecy of the Passion that he reproves his Master, and Jesus gives him so severe an answer. The account of the Transfiguration (IX. 1-9) has also all the appearance of being a story told by Peter. The opening scene of Jesus' ministry at Capharnaum (I. 16-38; II. 1-12) is not only laid in Peter's city, but develops round his dwelling. There are also many minor features in various stories—minute details, told with rare freshness, which give Mark's Gospel its vividness, its life, and its indisputable character of historical truthfulness, which may all come from

of consideration at the present day (Harnack, *Chronologie*, Vol. I, p. 691; Leipoldt, Vol. I, p. 145; Stanton, Vol. II, p. 187). But it is still retained by *Orpheus*, p. 220 (234).

descriptions given by Peter. Weiss concludes: "The information of Papias is thus confirmed for part of the narratives given by Mark." [1]

I should like to point out one last archaic aspect of Mark. You are none of you ignorant that the language spoken by Jesus and His Apostles was not Greek, nor even Hebrew, for this had been a dead language since the fourth century before our era, and was only preserved as a liturgical and literary language, as Latin is amongst ourselves since the prevalence of the Romance tongues. From the Euphrates to the Mediterranean, the Semitic dialect spoken was Aramaic, and this was the language of the Jews in Palestine. In the Gospel times, with the exception of a few accents and provincialisms, the same Aramaic was spoken both in Galilee and Judæa.[2] Some recent critics have supposed that our Gospel of Mark was originally composed in Aramaic;

[1] J. Weiss, *Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 42; Stanton, Vol. II, p. 180; H. B. Swete, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London, 1908), p. lxxii.

[2] See *John* xix. 13; *Acts* i. 19; xxvi. 14. St. John and St. Paul, instead of saying Aramaic, speak of "Hebrew." This, although inaccurate, signifies the Aramaic spoken at Jerusalem, the *πάτριος γλῶσσα* of Josephus. Cf. G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* (Leipzig, 1898), p. 5. When Papias (*apud* Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 39, 16) says that Matthew composed the *Logia* "in Hebrew" (*Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ*), he means that they were composed in Aramaic. We know that Josephus, however Hellenized he became, had great trouble in writing Greek, and that he originally composed and published his *Jewish War* in Aramaic before translating and editing it in Greek (Schürer, Vol. I, p. 79).

this theory has not met with general acceptance, but all are agreed in acknowledging that our St. Mark is incomparably more saturated with Aramaisms than either Luke or Matthew.[1] Mark wrote Greek like a foreigner who has not learned to write with literary style; he wrote as he spoke, and he no doubt spoke the Greek of other Jews of the first century in the great cities, Antioch or Rome. Luke and Matthew when they employ the same texts as Mark, discreetly alter their form, giving selected synonyms for the words which Mark has used without any misgiving. A more important detail is that Mark writes Greek like a man who thinks in Aramaic.[2] Lastly, Mark quotes a number of the actual Aramaic words used by Jesus, as I shall show by two examples.

The first of these is taken from the account of the raising of the daughter of Jairus. We are at Capharnaum, on the shore where Jesus has just stepped out of a boat. One of the chiefs of the synagogue at Capharnaum comes up and, falling at the feet of Jesus, implores Him to save his daughter who is dying. As Jairus is still speaking, they come to tell him that his child is dead. But Jesus says to him: "Fear not, only believe." And taking with Him Peter, James, and John, He goes to Jairus' house which is full of weeping women. Jesus drives out the crowd of mourners and enters with the parents, followed by Peter, James, and John, into the place where the child is lying. "And taking the

[1] J. Wellhausen, p. 15.

[2] Jülicher, p. 318 (283); Stanton, Vol. II, p. 13.

hand of the child, He said to her: Talitha cumi, which is to say: Young girl (I say to thee), arise." And immediately the child rose and walked, and she was twelve years old. The story is admirable in its sobriety, appropriateness, and freshness; and it is a scene which could well have been told by Peter. Luke in transcribing the account from Mark has not preserved the perfect simplicity and delicacy of the original; and Matthew, in his turn, has abbreviated it and left out the colouring. Mark alone reports the two words used by Jesus in Aramaic: Talitha cumi.[1]

Our second example of Aramaic quotation by Mark is from the seventh chapter. The locality is not determined more accurately than "in the middle of the Decapolis"—the country on the left bank of the Jordan—where a deaf-mute is brought to Jesus to be cured. Jesus, "having taken him apart from the crowd, put His fingers into his ears, and spitting, He touched his tongue; then lifting up His eyes towards heaven, He sighed and said: Ephphatha, that is: Be thou opened. And his ears were opened and his tongue was loosened, and he spoke correctly" (*Mark* VII. 31-37). Luke and Matthew have not repeated

[1] *Mark* V. 21-43; *Luke* VIII. 40-56; *Matthew* IX. 18-26. It is childish to ascribe to Mark the intention of giving *Talitha cumi* as a magical incantation. Mark insists too much on the simplicity of Jesus' action for such a thought to have entered his mind. As to the two Aramaic words, see J. T. Marshall, art. "Talitha cumi" in the *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, Vol. II, p. 697. The words "I say to thee" are an explanatory addition by the writer.

this story, which might have embarrassed their readers, while Mark goes even to the detail of giving the Aramaic words uttered by Jesus.[1]

We might give several other examples.[2] Taken together, and allowing for the fact that Luke and Matthew have effaced the local traits, they prove that Mark is nearer to the events described.

It may be asked, What do we know of the personality of Mark? He is stated by Papias and his Presbyter to have been the companion of St. Peter, and to have composed his Gospel according to the teaching of the Apostle. The New Testament contains an Epistle whose ascription to St. Peter is not disputed by any fair-minded critic.[3] It is contemporaneous with the Neronic persecution, and was written at Rome in A.D. 64. Peter writes these words towards the end of his letter: "It is by Sylvanus, a faithful brother (I know it), that I write these few words. . . . *She* who is at Babylon, chosen together with you, salutes you, and also Mark my son" (1 *Peter* v. 12-13). The affectionate title which Peter gives to Mark leads us to suppose that he was a more intimate disciple than Sylvanus. This latter is to carry the Epistle, while Mark remains with the Apostle at Rome.

[1] See Marshall, art. "Ephphatha" in the same *Dict.* Vol. I, p. 522, where he makes some curious observations on the peculiarities of dialect in the words employed by Jesus.

[2] *Mark* III. 17: Βοανηργές; VII. 11: κορβᾶν; XIV. 36: ἀββᾶ; XV. 34: Ἐλωΐ, Ἐλωΐ, λαμά σαβαχθανεί; etc. (Wellhausen, p. 38).

[3] See above, p. 39.

Paul wrote to the Colossians from Rome in A.D. 61-62. You will recollect that near the end he mentions the presence of "Luke the beloved physician." A few verses previously Paul had written: "Aristarchus, my companion in captivity, saluteth you and also Mark, the cousin of Barnabas; you have received directions concerning him, cherish him, if he cometh to you" (IV. 19). Paul adds that Mark, Aristarchus, and Justus, who are all three with him at Rome, are circumcised, and the only disciples of the circumcision who are labouring with him for the kingdom of God. We here learn that Mark had reached Rome before Peter, that he is the cousin of Barnabas, and that he is a Jew by birth. At the time Paul wrote to the Colossians, Mark was about to set out for Asia Minor. Later Paul exclaims: "Luke alone is with me. Take Mark and bring him with thee, for he is a great help to me in the ministry" (2 *Tim.* IV. 11-12). These lines are addressed to Timothy, and therefore Mark is with him, but will, no doubt, return to Paul at Rome. Notice the character given by Paul to Mark; he is of great help in the ministry of preaching the Christian faith, for he is one of those untiring and humble men, invaluable to those in high authority, like Paul or Peter, the model of the "servus servorum Dei," as Swete ingeniously puts it.[1]

Luke, who must have met Mark at Paul's side at Rome in A.D. 61-62, is careful to note in the Acts what he knows of him. He gives his full name, "John

[1] Swete, p. xx.

surnamed Mark" (*Acts* XII. 12), since according to the common practice of Jews at that time, Mark had a Roman name in addition to his national one. We know that Mark's mother was called Mary, and that she lived at Jerusalem, where she had a house large enough to be one of the meeting places for a considerable section of the Christian Church of Jerusalem in A.D. 42-44. Mark was a blood relation of Barnabas; this latter was a Levite, born at Cyprus, but living at Jerusalem. He became a Christian at the first hour of the Apostolic preaching. The Acts mention that he owned a field which he sold, laying the price at the feet of the Apostles (IV. 36-37). Later on, Barnabas is sent by the Church of Jerusalem as its delegate to Antioch (IX. 22); and he attaches Paul to himself, after going to seek him at Tarsus (XI. 25). In A.D. 43-44 Barnabas and Paul come to Jerusalem to bring help to "the brethren who inhabit Judæa," who were being tried by a great famine (XI. 30). When they have finished this ministry, they return to Antioch from Jerusalem, "bringing with them John, surnamed Mark" (XII. 25). They decide to take him with them on the mission they were undertaking together in Cyprus and Pisidia; but Mark leaves them and returns to Jerusalem (XIII. 13). In A.D. 50 it appears that Mark was at Antioch, where Barnabas and Paul have returned and are preparing for a new mission. Barnabas wishes to take Mark, "but Paul thought it not good to take with them as a companion a man who had quitted them." And the difference of opinion is such that Barnabas and Paul separate, Paul setting out for Cilicia with Silas

(Sylvanus), and Barnabas crossing over to Cyprus, taking Mark with him (xv. 35-40).

We find therefore that our Evangelist, Mark, was at Rome with the Apostle Paul in A.D. 61-62, and with Peter in 64. In 50 he is at Antioch with the Apostle Barnabas; and in 42-44 at Jerusalem, where his mother's house is a place of assembly for the Christians. After all this, it is of small moment whether Mark was the young man who was present at the arrest of Jesus in Gethsemane, of whom the second Gospel tells us that, being taken by some of the troop who were with Judas, he escaped from their hands, leaving them the linen garment in which he was clothed.[1] It is sufficient for us that Mark was more intimately connected than Luke with the Apostles

[1] Σινδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ. Swete, p. 354, notes the supposition that Mark was the young son of the owner of the house in which Jesus celebrated the Last Supper, and also that the Garden of Olives belonged to his mother; to which is added the fact that his having a special night garment, shows that he is a member of a family in easy circumstances. All these ingenious conjectures are outside the text of Scripture. Still the identification of Mark with the young man who fled away naked is accepted by St. Ambrose and St. John Chrysostom, and can neither be proved nor refuted, and the incident may remain "Like an artist's signature, hidden away in the corner of the picture," whatever *Orpheus* may say on the subject, p. 217 (319). Wellhausen, p. 87, believes that the second Gospel was composed at Jerusalem; Jülicher, p. 321 (279), says that the Gospel of Mark gives the impression that its author was "a born Jew" (of Jerusalem?), "familiar with the circle of the original Apostles, and especially interested in Peter, but also a much-travelled person, rejoicing in the fact that the Gospel was to be preached to all nations" (xiii. 10).

Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, and that by his family he was attached to the first hour of the Christian Church at Jerusalem.

III.

Since the Gospel of St. Mark was, as we have seen, the principal source of Luke (and Matthew), it is a work which was in existence before the year A.D. 62. Critics also believe that they can indicate another document of the same nature which served as a secondary source to Luke and Matthew. This hypothetical gospel is usually designated by the algebraical symbol Q, the initial letter of the German word *Quelle* (source). I am going to attempt giving you some elementary idea of this Q, which critics discover in those portions of Luke and Matthew which agree together without being derived from Mark. We shall follow such Catholic exegetists as Camerlynck and Coppieters.[1]

Q begins at the preaching of St. John the Baptist, which is followed by the Temptation in the desert. The Galilean ministry opens with a didactic exposition, the "Sermon on the Mount." Jesus, on His arrival at Capharnaum, heals the son of the centurion. John the Baptist, from his prison, sends disciples to Jesus, to ask if He is the expected Messiah. Then comes a series of sayings and groups of sayings; the curse on Capharnaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida; another series of sayings and groups of sayings; the curse on the Pharisees; more sayings and parables;

[1] *Synopsis*, p. xxvi.

finally the apostrophe over Jerusalem and some last maxims. We must confess that the sum total is rather amorphous. In essence it is a collection of the sayings, or *logia* of Jesus, of which the most typical example is the Sermon on the Mount; and to these are added a certain number of narratives and some parables.[1]

The ministry of the Saviour is placed at Capharnaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida, in the region north of the Lake of Gennezareth. A prominent position is given to St. John the Baptist. The name of Jerusalem occurs in one discourse which must have been delivered there. It is not believed that Q contained an account of the Passion. It was a gospel; but not in the form of an historical narrative, following the type adopted by Mark, and after him by the other Evangelists. It was a compilation of sayings and discourses belonging to the horizon of Galilee. It is supposed to have been originally written in Aramaic, and Harnack considers it older than Mark.[2]

Harnack thinks that this gospel was composed by Matthew, since Papias relates that he had "com-

[1] Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, p. 88, restores the text of Q as extracted from Luke and Matthew. J. Weiss, *Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 37, observes that other portions may be incorporated with Q, which have been adopted by Luke alone or Matthew alone. The text reconstructed by Harnack is, therefore, a minimum, such as the text of Mark would be, if we only had Matthew and Luke to reconstruct it from. Wernle, *Sources*, p. 70.

[2] *Sayings of Jesus*, p. 118.

posed the *logia*, in the Hebrew dialect," i.e. in Aramaic.[1]

Critics attach great importance to the existence of this Aramaic gospel used by Luke and Matthew. Harnack does not hesitate to say: "Whoever the author, or rather the redactor, of Q may have been, he was a man deserving of the highest respect. To his reverence and faithfulness, to his simple-minded common sense, we owe this priceless compilation of the sayings of Jesus. Our knowledge of the teaching and the history of Our Lord, in their main features at least, thus depends upon two authorities independent of one another, yet composed at nearly the same time. Where they agree, their testimony is strong, and they agree often and on important points. On the rock of their united testimony the assault of destructive critical views, however necessary these are to easily self-satisfied research, will ever be

[1] In the same sense, Jülicher, p. 318 (262); De Grandmaison, in the *Revue biblique*, 1907, p. 441, gives a summary of the views of W. Allen and says: "The traditional data can be easily explained, if we suppose that the final editor of our Gospel (of St. Matthew) in the main drew what is original from the *logia* written in Aramaic by the Apostle Matthew. Two-fifths of the present book, and all that is characteristic and distinguishes it from the other Synoptics, could thus easily have been the original work of the Apostle himself. The Gospel would be called *a principali parte*." This solution, with slight differences, is also proposed by A. S. Barnes, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, January, 1905, p. 188 *et seq.* De Grandmaison expresses some reserve on the subject, and concludes: "There is no more complex problem in the criticism of the whole New Testament."

shattered to pieces."[1] Wernle, though less ardent than Harnack, still considers that Q may be the work of St. Matthew written originally in Aramaic. This possibility, in fact, can neither be proved nor disproved. But, he adds, Q, considered as a collection of the sayings of Jesus, "contains so great a treasury of the words of the Master, that a veritable eye-witness might well be the author." The homogeneity of Q is less perceptible to Wernle than to Harnack, and he refuses to believe that the composition is earlier than A.D. 68; but this last assertion is not, in our opinion, now tenable. After accumulating criticisms, Wernle concludes: "On the whole, the historical value of these discourses is very high; . . . with the words of the Lord in Mark, they give us our truest insight into the heart of the Gospel."[2]

Some quotations will allow us to judge the character of Q. The Sermon on the Mount, in those parts which Luke and Matthew have in common, gives the best idea of its contents and style; remembering that this "sermon" was not pronounced as it stands, in one given place and at one given time, but is rather an harmonious grouping of maxims pro-

[1] *Sayings*, p. 249 (172).

[2] Wernle, *Sources*, p. 138 (71). Wellhausen, p. 88, considers that Q is a document from Jerusalem, "more pronounced on the subject of Jesus than Mark, and also more recent." After these quotations we can set their true value on such assertions as the following from *Orpheus*, p. 222 (327): "There remain the sources of Mark and of Matthew, notably Q, and the basis of Mark . . . two sources, of whose authority we have no guarantee."

nounced by Jesus on different occasions.[1] It opens with an exposition of the kingdom of God :—

(Jesus) taught His disciples saying : Blessed are the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of God. Blessed are the afflicted, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the hungry, for they shall be filled. Blessed are ye, when ye shall be outraged and persecuted and when they shall say all kinds of evil lying of you ; be glad and rejoice because your reward shall be great in heaven ; for thus have they persecuted the prophets who were before you . . . (*Matt.* v. 1-4, 6, 11-12 ; *Luke* vi. 17, 20-23).

But I say to you : Love your enemies, pray for them that persecute you, so that ye may become the sons of your Father, who maketh His sun to rise on the wicked and on the good (*Matt.* v. 44-45 ; *Luke* vi. 28, 35).

By the fruit ye shall know the tree ; do men gather raisins from the acanthus, or figs from thistles ? (*Matt.* vii. 16 ; *Luke* vi. 44).

Whosoever heareth My words and practiseth them shall be compared to a man who built his house upon a rock ; and the rain fell, and the torrents came, and the winds blew, and they cast themselves upon that house, and it did not fall ; for it was founded upon a rock. And whosoever heareth My words and doth not practise them shall be compared to a man who built his house upon the sand. And the rains fell, and the torrents came, and the winds blew, and they cast themselves upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof (*Matt.* vii. 24-27 ; *Luke* vi. 47-49).

We must observe how foreign these short sentences are to the Greek genius ; and at the same time take note of the Palestinian colour of this flora of raisins, acanthus, and thistles, of rock and sand, of sudden torrents and storms of wind.[2]

[1] Rose, *Évangile selon saint Mathieu* (Paris, 1906), p. 30.

[2] Lagrange, *Revue biblique*, 1896, p. 31, on the words ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοί, writes : "This is very easy to grasp in Palestine ;

The contrast between the preaching of John and of Jesus, with the spirit proper to each, is brought out frequently, showing the difference of position and of the part played by the Baptist and the Son of Man.

John said (to the crowd) who came to be baptized: Ye brood of vipers, who hath shown you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring then forth fruit worthy of penance. And do not say within yourselves: We have Abraham for a father, for I tell you that God can raise up from these stones children to Abraham. But now the axe is laid at the root of the trees. Therefore every tree that beareth not good fruit shall be cut down and cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you with water for penance, but He that shall come after me is stronger than I, and I am not worthy to carry His shoes. He will baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire; the winnowing fan is in His hand, and He will sweep his threshing floor, and He will gather His wheat into the barn, but the chaff He will burn with unquenchable fire (*Matt.* III. 5, 7-12; *Luke* III. 3, 7-9, 16-17).

Jesus describes the Baptist as a prophet,

Yea, I tell you, and more than a prophet. . . . And I tell you, there hath not arisen amongst the children of women a greater than John; but the least in the kingdom of God is greater than he (*Matt.* XI. 9, 11; *Luke* VII. 26, 28).

On the other hand, the preaching of Jesus is of the kingdom of God and is accredited by the miracles which accompany it.

And John having learned in prison the works of Christ, sent his disciples to say to Him: Art Thou He who art to come, or do we wait for another? And answering He said to them: Go,

the rain really gives birth to torrential floods, where there was no water previously, and the wind always blows at the same time that the rain falls. But these streams that *come* are an enigma in other countries."

tell John what you have heard and seen : the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised to life, and the poor are evangelized. And blessed is he that shall not be scandalized in Me (*Matt.* xi. 2-6 ; *Luke* vii. 18-23).

From texts similar to the last quoted, we correctly infer that Q was just as eager as Mark on the miracles of Jesus.[1] Witness the cure of the centurion's servant at Capharnaum. He was not a Jew, for there were none in the Roman army. The Evangelist does not on that account make less of the pagan's faith : " I tell you, I have not found such faith in all Israel." And Jesus adds : " Be it done unto thee according as thou hast believed " (*Matt.* viii. 5-13 ; *Luke* vii. 1-10). We have here another contrast between the faith of the pagan and the incredulity of the Jews.

I do not see on what grounds Harnack bases his assertion that Q does not speak of the disciples. The Twelve are not, indeed, mentioned by name, but disciples appear by the side of Jesus, separate from the vague crowds ; and Jesus gives them instructions with regard to preaching the Gospel confided to them : " Behold I send you as sheep amongst wolves " (*Matt.* ix. 37-38 ; *Luke* x. 2).—" The harvest is abundant, but the labourers few ; pray the Lord of the harvest, that He send labourers into His harvest " (*Matt.* x. 16 ; *Luke* x. 3). " He who receiveth you, receiveth Me, and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me " (*Matt.* x. 40 ; *Luke* x. 16).

The superhuman dignity of Jesus is affirmed not only by special titles, such as Christ and Son of Man,

[1] So also of the expulsion of demons : *Matt.* xii. 22-30, 43-45 ; *Luke* xi. 14-20, 23-26.

but also in expressions like the following: "The men of Ninive will one day rise up against this people and will judge it, for they were converted by the message of Jonas; now there is a greater than Jonas here." The same also is said of the Queen of Saba, "for there is a greater than Solomon here" (*Matt.* XII. 41-42; *Luke* XI. 29-32).

Blessed are your eyes, for they have seen, and blessed are your ears, for they have heard. I tell you, that many of the prophets have desired to see what you have seen and have not seen it, and to hear what you have heard and have not heard it (*Matt.* XIII. 16-17; *Luke* X. 23-24).

In those days He said: I bless Thee, Father, Master of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and skilful, and hast revealed them to little children. Yea, Father, for such hath been (Thy) good pleasure before Thee. All things have been given Me by the Father, and . . . no one knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son shall choose to reveal Him (*Matt.* XI. 25-27; *Luke* X. 21-22).[1]

[1] I have taken these quotations from the text of Q conjecturally restored by Harnack. In the last verse, he quite arbitrarily suppresses the words "and no one knoweth the Father but the Son." He is afraid of the Christology implied. "If," he says, "the first evangelist himself wrote the passage . . . then . . . his own Christology approached very nearly to that of the Johannine writings in one of the most important points," *Sayings*, p. 302 (211). With the exception of this one detail, Harnack defends strongly the authenticity of these sayings of the Saviour. "(Q) belongs to the best authority we possess concerning our Lord, nor can any valid objection be alleged against its contents"—when once, he adds, "it is restored to its original form:" *ibid.* p. 309 (215). We cannot grant him this. For a defence of the integrity, see J. Lebreton, *Origines du dogme de la Trinité*, p. 470, and J. Chapman, *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. X (1909), p. 552.

With these last lines we really penetrate to the heart of the Gospel, and find revealed the "Filial consciousness" beyond the "Messianic consciousness" of Jesus. The Son of Man is a prophet and the Messiah, but He is more. He is the Son of the Father, of an unique Sonship; and this is the secret which He brings; He first, He alone, to His little children, the disciples who hear and follow Him. Q is here very like St. John.

IV.

We now come to the third source of Luke, from which he has obtained the information which is not also in St. Mark or St. Matthew.[1] We shall pass over what St. Luke tells us of the infancy of John the Baptist and of Jesus, i.e. the whole of the first two chapters with the exception of the prologue. Whatever may be the origin of these stories of the infancy, they are, for us who believe, an integral part of our faith; still they form a distinct section which has its own homogeneity and colouring, and which would demand a special examination which I cannot go into here.[2] Besides the story of the infancy, the information peculiar to Luke is either given in large sections (parables or complete incidents), or simple notes (words or details); and we can no longer speak of a single homogeneous source.

[1] Camerlynck and Coppieters, p. xxvii.

[2] I am glad to be able to refer my readers to A. Durand, *L'Enfance de Jésus Christ d'après les Évangiles canoniques* (Paris, 1908), especially p. 135.

Luke must have applied here the same method as in the first part of the Acts ; he listened, he took notes, and he worked them up into his narrative. Certain highly developed passages, with very delicate shading, such as the meeting of Jesus and the two disciples going to Emmaus (XXIV. 13-35), show that he has laboured to bring the story home to us; other portions, on the contrary, seem like uncut gems, inserted without retouching, just as they were gathered together, sometimes even defaced or obscure. Such is the parable of the unjust steward (XVI. 1-10). The important thing for us is to account for the manner in which Luke obtained his information.

We have already noticed how careful Luke is to set down all the proper names he knows. Thus in the Acts he names all the prophets and *didascali* whom he knows to have been at Antioch with Barnabas and Paul in A.D. 42 : Simeon, called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, and "Manahen who had been foster-brother of Herod the Tetrarch." This Manahen was not a Greek but a Jew, as his name implies. He belonged by birth to the highest Jewish society, since he had been brought up with Herod-Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee, one of the sons of King Herod the Great. We can compare this list with another in the third Gospel (VIII. 1-3) : Jesus was going from place to place in Galilee, preaching the good news of the kingdom of God, and He was accompanied by the Twelve and also by some women whom He had cured : "Mary, called of Magdala, from whom He had driven out seven devils, Joanna, the wife of Chuza, the steward of Herod, Susanna, and several others, who

assisted Him of their substance." [1] The wife of one of Herod-Antipas' principal officers must also have been a woman of rank. Now Luke alone mentions these Christians of the household of Herod; and this mention has its value, since Luke has special information to give about Herod-Antipas and his sentiments towards Jesus. He represents the Tetrarch as being at first troubled by what he hears of Jesus, curious to see Him (IX. 9); later he is disposed to seize Him and put Him to death (XIII. 31-33). At the time of the Passion, Herod has come up to Jerusalem for the Paschal feast, and Luke alone tells us that Pilate, learning that Jesus is a Galilean, sends Him to the Tetrarch of that country: When Herod saw Jesus, he had great joy, for he had desired to see Him a long time, because of what he had heard of Him, and he hoped to see Him do some miracle. He addressed Him many questions; but Jesus did not answer him anything. . . . Herod and his guard treated Him with scorn, and, having derided Him and clothed Him in a brilliant robe, he sent Him back to Pilate. That same day Pilate and Herod became friends, from enemies which they had been before (XXIII. 8-12).

This story of the trial of Jesus by Herod is a portion of history to which no serious objection can be

[1] At the foot of the cross, Mark (XV. 40-41) places Mary Magdalene, Salome the wife of Zebedee (the mother of James and John), and Mary (the wife of Cleophas), the mother of James and Joses. Mark represents them as having followed and served Jesus, "when He was in Galilee." But he knows nothing of Susanna nor Joanna.

raised.[1] It shows that Luke had access to particular information about Herod and Jesus from the best sources; and we know that the wife of Chuza was in Jerusalem at the time of the Passion (XXIV. 10).

We must set the same value on other details, such as the episode of Martha and Mary (X. 38-42); the woman in the crowd who cried out: "Blessed is the womb that bore Thee, and the paps that gave Thee suck" (XI. 27-28); the story of Zacheus (XIX. 1-10); the inhospitable reception met with by Jesus at the Samaritan village, and the anger of James and John (IX. 51-56); the request of the man who had a lawsuit with his brother for part of their inheritance (XII. 13-15). These features and some others, according to Wernle, "Luke reproduces as he found them," and we may believe that he found them in some written document; they are features "of the highest value."[2]

We owe a debt of gratitude to Wernle for defending against critics of his own school the value of that beautiful story peculiar to Luke, of the sinful woman who forced her way into the house of the Pharisee when Jesus was at table, and, kneeling at His feet, bathed them with her tears and anointed them with the perfume which she had brought with her in an alabaster vase. This narrative is one of the most touching which we owe to Luke alone, and it is not a replica of the scene which Mark places at Bethania. Weiss has clearly pointed out the originality of Luke's

[1] J. Weiss, Vol. I, p. 519. [2] Wernle, p. 149 (79).

account.[1] This episode is at the same time an event and a moral tale. In this double aspect it resembles the account of the woman taken in adultery, which we find in our fourth Gospel (*John* VIII. 1-11). We must not therefore be surprised to see that several manuscripts have interpolated this latter narrative in the Gospel of St. Luke. We know that it is missing from the oldest Greek MSS. of St. John's Gospel. It is quite in Luke's style, for Luke set himself, with characteristic persistence, to bring out, in the teaching of Jesus, all that indicates mercy towards sinners. If then the story of the adulterous woman is granted to have the most solid synoptical tradition, the same must be said of the pardoned sinner.

Luke is also alone in giving us many parables which are not recorded by the other Evangelists: the good Samaritan (X. 29-37); the importunate friend (XI. 5-8); the rich fool (XII. 16-21); the barren fig-tree (XIII. 1-9); the man who built the tower and the king who went to war (XIV. 28-33); the lost drachma (XV. 8-10); the prodigal son (XV. 11-32); the poor man, Lazarus (XV. 19-31); the useless servants (XVII. 1-10); the unjust judge (XVIII. 1-8); the Pharisee and the publican (XVIII. 9-14). The mere enumeration calls up the most touching recollections, and the most unforgettable portions of the Gospel, and they are all from St. Luke. I am quite ready, with Wernle, to believe that Luke found them all in one written account, and that he only had to set them

[1] *Luke* VII. 36-50; it is wrong to make this a doublet of *Mark* X. 3-9; *Matt.* XXVI. 6-13. Weiss, Vol. I, p. 451.

in what he considered their right place in his narrative.[1] As to the authenticity of these parables, I shall return to them in a week's time, when I treat of the authenticity of the Gospel parables in general. It will be sufficient here to notice in passing the subjects to which Luke gives the preference; the precariousness of riches, the consolation of being poor, the value of mercy, humility, and repentance.

Luke's feeling is betrayed in this preference, and also in the deep sense he has of evangelical perfection. It has been said, perhaps with too much ingenuity, that if in the Gospel of Matthew we have the "Church of the bishops," in the Gospel of Luke we have the "religion of the monks," with its precepts of voluntary poverty, fasting, and prayer.[2] We may add with its joyousness. It is at least an indication of the complex richness of the Gospel that one Evangelist does not suffice to express all its contents; and the asceticism and mercy so well illustrated by Luke are not its least deep and attractive element.

Luke is a writer who composed his Gospel from documents and notes, but he is far more; he is a writer who knows how to tell his story; and some of his narratives are "amongst the noblest gems of the narrative art."[3] If Luke had given rein to his artistic imagination in the recital of those things of which he is the only writer, we should have a formidable array of critics against him in those parts in which he runs parallel to Mark and Matthew.

[1] Wernle, p. 148 (78).
[2] Jülicher, p. 338 (295).
[3] Harnack, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 207.

V.

Since the Gospel of St. Matthew is partly derived from St. Mark and Q, we need only give our attention to those portions which are peculiar to himself. As in the case of St. Luke, we will pass over what he relates of the Infancy: the genealogy, Nativity, the Magi, and the flight into Egypt.

Those critics who are most severe towards the author, whoever he be, of the first Gospel, are never tired of acknowledging the excellence of many passages which he alone gives. Especially is this the case for the parables: the sower of tares (XIII. 24-30); the hidden treasure (44); the pearl (45-46); the net (47-50); the wicked servant (XVIII. 23-35); the labourers at the eleventh hour (XX. 1-16); the two sons (XXI. 28-32); the wise and foolish virgins (XXV. 1-13). Detached maxims are also to be found: on almsgiving (VI. 1-4); on prayer (5-15); on fasting (16-18); on celibacy (XIX. 10-12); on the judgment of the nations by the Son of Man (XXV. 31-46). It is possible that some of these may be drawn from Q by Matthew, and that Luke omitted them, since he allowed himself the right of selection.[1]

Other portions and features which are special to Matthew are, on the contrary, sacrificed by Wernle. This is not our conclusion, particularly for the promise to Peter (XVI. 17-19). We have defended this text elsewhere,[2] and we are therefore not dis-

[1] Wernle, p. 141 (75); De Grandmaison, *Rev. bib.* 1907, p. 438.

[2] *L'Église naissante et le catholicisme*, p. 94. Jülicher, p. 314 (271), says: "[St. Matthew's Gospel] represents the stand-

pleased to find Wernle, who disputes it, acknowledging that "The Catholics have been perfectly justified in understanding this word in a Catholic, a Roman sense." We are grateful for the concession thus made to us, and we are also grateful to him because, in spite of his radicalism, he owns that Matthew "has preserved ancient traditions with remarkable faithfulness." This judgment counts for Luke as well as Matthew, since in both cases Wernle recognizes that the most radical criticism we can bring to bear on their methods of composition "cannot detract from the value of [their] great and precious treasure of exquisite parables and episodes, through which Jesus Himself speaks to us with pristine freshness." [1]

Eclectic critics from Germany date the composition of Matthew's Gospel about the year A.D. 100 (Jülicher), or within the period 70-100 (Weiss). Harnack, with a juster sense of the general development of Christian literature, places it between 70 and 75. Ecclesiastical writers do not think that the date can be put later than 70. If it is granted that Matthew has employed the same sources as Luke (namely, Mark and Q) for part of his Gospel, and also that he did not know Luke, nor was known by him, we shall

point, not of Paul, nor of Peter, nor of Apollos . . . but of the *Church*, the building of which he alone foretells in the triumphant words of XVI. 18 [On this rock I will build My Church, etc.];" i.e. the famous passage on Peter belongs to the framework of the first Gospel. So also Wellhausen, p. 70. *Orpheus*, p. 224 (330): "The passage in Matthew [XVI. 18] . . . is obviously an interpolation."

[1] Wernle, p. 152 (80).

not be far wrong in supposing that they both wrote about the same time.[1]

The Gospel of St. Matthew, if we are to believe Harnack, "most probably . . . is to be assigned to the Hellenistic portion of the primitive community of Jerusalem," i.e. the same circle of Christians to which Barnabas and Mark belong. The Gospel of Matthew is from the horizon of Palestine; it is "the work of the Church of Palestine . . . free from the yoke of the Law and kindly disposed towards the Gentiles." As our Evangelist Mark is from Jerusalem, and Q represents a Palestinian tradition, we can state without fear of contradiction that "the whole synoptic tradition belongs to Palestine and Jerusalem, and has no connexion with Gentile Christian circles except in the redaction of St. Luke."[2]

It is a curious thing that, whereas the Gospel according to St. Luke was written for Theophilus, a converted pagan, and St. Mark's also for pagans, converted or to be converted, and therefore both would appear to be specially suited to Græco-Roman Christians, it was the Gospel according to St. Matthew

[1] De Grandmaison, *Rev. bib.* 1907, p. 441: "The date of the composition [of Matthew] is placed [by Allen] about A.D. 70, or a little earlier; a date against which there is nothing to object, and which corresponds to the data of the problem." For Jülicher, p. 367 (324), Matthew and Luke are fairly simultaneous, neither knows the other, both had the same motives for writing, and they draw from the same or parallel sources. It is true that Jülicher dates Matthew from about A.D. 100.

[2] *Luke the Physician*, p. 169 (117).

which was more highly appreciated by that Church, although it is the work of an Hellenistic Jew, who was penetrated by the idea of proving the Messianic prophecies realized in Jesus Christ, and of answering the calumnies of those Jews who opposed the new faith.[1] The Gentile Church substituted the Gospel of St. Matthew for the dialectics of St. Paul. Harnack adds: "So the Gospel which . . . bears witness to its origin from Jerusalem . . . has become the chief Gospel of the Gentile Church." We can realize the individualities of Mark and of Luke from their work, but it is otherwise with the Evangelist whom we call St. Matthew, and this suggests that the "Gospel of St. Matthew is not in the least a book which reflects the views of one man or a small circle. It was compiled for the use of the Church (Gemeindebuch)." It is a public and impersonal book which can be called "the first liturgical book of the Christian Church". . . and that "the Church of Palestine." [2]

[1] Jülicher, pp. 308 (265), 314 (271), accentuates strongly the *Catholic* spirit of Matthew. So also Wellhausen, p. 70. This interesting judgment confirms the opinion of Harnack, from whom we did not hope to obtain such an expression of opinion: of finding Catholicism in the first liturgical book of the Christian Church in Palestine!

[2] Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 169 (119). Wellhausen, p. 88, also recognizes in Matthew "very distinctly the flavour of the soil from the community at Jerusalem."—We can see how little we need concede to statements like the following from Reinach, p. 222 (326): "Broadly speaking, our Gospels tell us what different Christian communities believed concerning Jesus between the year A.D. 70 and 100."

VI.

If I have said nothing as yet about the Gospel according to St. John, and if I only intend to say a few words on it, it is because this Gospel, being composed last of all (between A.D. 90 and 100), at Ephesus in Asia, is a work apart and, we might say, *sui generis*. The Apostle St. John has left us two books, the Apocalypse and the fourth Gospel; and they are so dissimilar in kind from one another, that it is an enigma how they can both be by the same writer.[1] And if the interpretation of the Apocalypse is a problem reckoned among the most difficult for critics, we might venture to say that the interpretation of the fourth Gospel sets the critics a problem not less difficult, though of another order; this is what goes by the name of the Johannine question. I shall attempt to set before you four considerations from the most reliable ecclesiastical teaching which will show you in what this very practical question consists.

1. The difficulty is not as to whether John was the author of the fourth Gospel; we can take it as settled that this Gospel is correctly ascribed to the Apostle St. John.[2] This statement is the traditional one

[1] See Jacquier, Vol. IV, p. 321. Harnack, *Chronologie*, Vol. I, p. 675, writes those words so often quoted: "I confess the critical heresy, which refers the Apocalypse and the Gospel to one single author." It is true that Harnack ascribes them to another "John" not the Apostle. *Orpheus*, p. 240 (352), follows Harnack in this.

[2] J. Armitage Robinson, *The Study of the Gospels* (London, 1903), p. 161, points out an article, "John the son of

of the Church, and is supported by testimony of the first order (Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Theophilus of Antioch, and the Muratorian Canon), and by evidence suggested from the internal critical study of the Gospel itself.[1] For my humble part, it seems that the Gospel makes such a striking contrast to the synoptics both in general outline and in details, and this contrast has so little escaped the readers of the second century, that I cannot conceive the Church would have accepted and canonized the fourth Gospel unless she was led to do so by the certainty that it was the work of the disciple whom Jesus loved. We can trust the Church of the second century.

2. The controversy between critics bears upon the character of the fourth Gospel. The critics of the extreme left, such as Loisy, turn the fourth Gospel into a purely symbolic work. They tell us that the

Zebedee," in Cheyne's *Encyclopædia Biblica* (the article is by Schmiedel), as a summary of what can be said against the authenticity of the fourth Gospel. In favour of the authenticity he cites the works of Lightfoot and Westcott, and adds: "For myself, I may say that I find at present less difficulty on literary grounds in accepting than in rejecting the Johannine authorship." *Orpheus*, p. 240 (353): "The author of Revelation calls himself John the Apostle, and addresses the seven Churches of Asia; as he was not the Apostle John, who died perhaps in Palestine about 66, he was a forger." The supposition that the Apostle John died in A.D. 66, being put to death by the Jews in Palestine, has no serious foundation. Wellhausen, p. 87; Jacquier, Vol. IV, p. 94; F. Spitta, *Zeitschrift für die neut. Wissenschaft*, 1910, p. 39.

[1] M. Lepin, *L'Origine du quatrième Évangile* (Paris, 1907); E. Jacquier, *Hist. des livres du N.T.* (Paris, 1908), Vol. IV, p. 51.

narratives of St. John are not history properly so called, but a "mystical contemplation of the Gospel," and his discourses "theological meditations on the mystery of salvation." If we once grant the principle of interpretation by symbolism, we could apply the measure with subtlety or rigour to all the narratives and all the discourses in the fourth Gospel—this has been attempted—but by doing so, we should at one stroke convert the Gospel into an intricate and systematized work, exactly of the standard suited to the commentator, and we produce a most marvellous feat of sleight of hand. We must not therefore be surprised that critics soon threw off this symbolical interpretation, which, though only dating from yesterday, is already in its decline.[1]

Here then are two definite statements in which liberal critics might easily agree with ecclesiastical

[1] J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin, 1908); F. Spitta, *Das Johannes Evangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu* (Göttingen, 1910); M. Goguel, *Les sources du récit johannique de la Passion* (Paris, 1910). I in no way hold myself responsible for these new opinions, and only mention them as symptoms of retrogression, in the sense in which Goguel writes (p. 4): "The time is past when we could consider the Johannine narrative, with Jean Reville and Loisy, as a deliberate and systematic deformation of the synoptic narrative. The problem before us at the present moment is infinitely more complex. We must now study what sources have been employed by the author or authors of the fourth Gospel." Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 250 (157), had already indicated some very remarkable points of resemblance between the Gospel of St. Luke and that of John; Luke and John could have obtained these points from the same Jerusalemite tradition.

teachers: (1) That the fourth Gospel must be attributed to the Apostle John; (2) That the narratives and discourses in the fourth Gospel are not fictions.

3. The Church demands more from her teachers, for she will not allow us to say, with Wernle for instance, that the discourses in the fourth Gospel represent what Jesus had become to the Evangelist: the Way, the Truth, the Life, the Lamb of God, the Bread of life, and the Light of the world;—or, to use the words of Loisy, that the fourth Gospel is not a testimony to the life of Christ on earth but to the life of Christ in the Church at the end of the first century. If we granted this, the "truths" of the fourth Gospel would be fiction as compared with real history.[1]

4. What then is the true character of the testimony given by the Apostle John to Jesus? I answer that this testimony is in part analogous to that given by the Synoptics, and in part not analogous.

(*a*) In so far as it is analogous, it adds to the testimony of the Synoptics, and it is for us to study how it fits in and harmonizes with them. Our Catholic exegetists have applied themselves, especially in these last few years, to proving the historical value of the fourth Gospel where it corresponds with the Synoptics, and the proof is strong.[2]

[1] Still, as to the share of the Evangelist in his own Gospel, see Lebreton, p. 374. See also P. de Grandmaison, *Revue biblique*, 1904, p. 431.

[2] Jacquier, Vol. IV, p. 294; Lepin, *Valeur historique du 4^me^ Évangile* (Paris, 1910). It is interesting to find in agreement with us: W. Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*

(*b*) Where the testimony of St. John is no longer analogous to that of the Synoptics, we must acknowledge that he goes beyond them by assertions whose only guarantee is our faith in the inspiration of the Evangelist. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God." History is not competent to deal with such assertions as this, and they only claim our assent, because of our faith in the sacred writer who enunciates them. It is the same with all other assertions in the fourth Gospel which cannot be verified by history. We hold them to be true because they are inspired, and we hold them to be inspired because the Church guarantees them as such. We should understand in this sense, and in this sense only, the words of St. Augustine which are so frequently misinterpreted: "*Euangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae Ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas.* I should not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me to it." [1] We can trust the Church of all time.

I have proposed a distinction between two elements

(Oxford, 1905); J. Armitage Robinson, *The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel* (London, 1908).

[1] St. Augustine, *Contra Epistulam Fundamenti*, 5 (ed. Zycha, p. 197). St. Augustine is replying to a Manichee, who wishes to prove his doctrine from the Gospel. "I receive the Gospel from the Church," says the Doctor, "and this very Church condemns Manichaeism." He solves the difficulty by raising the previous question. Both St. Augustine and his opponent acknowledged the Divine authority of the Gospel. *Orpheus*, p. 222 (327), holds that for Augustine the Gospel had no authority except that ascribed to it by the Church—attributing to the Saint a negation which he never imagined.

in St. John's Gospel: (*a*) one element accessible and verifiable by human criticism; (*b*) the other element surpasses nature, and is of pure Divine faith. This distinction is suggested by St. Thomas Aquinas, when he divides God's miracles into two classes: those which are the object of our faith (*de quibus est fides*), and those which serve to prove the faith (*ad fidei comprobationem*). The first being inaccessible, such as the virginal conception, or the act itself of the Resurrection; the other being clear and manifest.[1] To classify in this manner the data of the fourth Gospel does not diminish its Divine authority, but, acknowledging this, it points out, for the purposes of our apologetic work, those facts whose historic truth can "be determined by methods which make their reality more effective in the eyes of historical critics." [2]

We will stop here, Gentlemen, and excuse ourselves for having so dryly analysed the Gospel of our Divine Master, as if we were indifferent critics. A martyr of the primitive Church, St. Ignatius of Antioch, used to say: "I draw near to the Gospel, as to the body of Jesus," and not only "draw near," but also "I take refuge in it." After all the criticism we have expended, and after proving the security of this refuge,

[1] Aquinas, *Summa Theol.* III. q. 29, a. 1, ad 2: "Sciendum tamen quod miraculorum Dei quaedam sunt de quibus est fides, sicut miraculum virginei partus et resurrectionis Domini, et etiam sacramentum altaris; et ideo Dominus voluit ista occultiora esse, ut fides eorum magis meritoria esset; quaedam vero miracula sunt ad fidei comprobationem, et ista debent esse manifesta."

[2] Gardeil, *La crédibilité et l'apologétique* (Paris, 1908), p. 170.

I invite you to think only of the real presence of the Saviour which your faith finds there. What men of little faith we should be, if, in the presence of the ciborium, we should fix our attention solely on the metal and goldsmith's work!

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE DISCOURSES OF JESUS.

(17 April, 1910.)

Gentlemen,

The best established results of literary criticism which I have brought before you, as to the origin of the Gospels, make clear and justify what we learn from the most ancient witnesses on this subject.[1] The least doubtful results effected by the critics are, perhaps still, that they have arranged the texts of the first three Gospels in groups or "families, whose intimate correspondence shows their relationship, whatever source we ascribe to them,"[2] and at the same time they have shown that all these families of

[1] Camerlynck and Coppieters, p. x, reproduce the "antiquiora testimonia de origine evangeliorum synopticorum," Papias, St. Irenæus, the canon called after Muratori, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and St. Jerome. Reinach, p. 217 (319), quotes some lines of radical criticism from Loisy against these primitive witnesses, especially Papias. But on p. 220 (324) Reinach declares that the testimony of Papias is "of the utmost importance." As good critics, we must either conclude that Reinach contradicts himself, or that he has misunderstood Loisy's words.

[2] De Grandmaison, *Revue biblique*, 1907, p. 440.

texts are derived from the Christians of the first generation in Judæa. This is the conclusion of Harnack in particular; and you will forgive me if I quote once more his formula, "during the years A.D. 30-70 and on the soil of Palestine — more particularly in Jerusalem—this tradition as a whole took the essential form which it presents in its later development."[1]

We have only one more step to take. It is not sufficient for us to find the Gospel treasure in the hands of Judæan Christians, unless we can show that they obtained it from Jesus Himself. We have therefore before us the task of verifying the authenticity of the words of Jesus as reported in the Gospels. This is the subject of our present lecture.

I.

The value which the first generation of Christians attached to the Word of the Lord is known to us from the way in which St. Paul appeals to it, as we have already seen. Writing to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians, he invokes the Word of the Lord as the sovereign authority. We have also noted how the maxims of Jesus and the subjects He taught are to be recognized in the framework of Paul's Epistles. The Apostle refers to them without explicit quotation, as if referring to a doctrine present in the minds of

[1] Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. vi (iv). Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, p. 89, says in less happy phrase: "The material of the Synoptics, with a few exceptions, was derived from a tradition which had its home in Jerusalem, or at least in Palestine and Syria."

all. The Churches of Judæa were animated by the same spirit. We read in the Epistle of St. James: "Receive with meekness the word which hath been grafted on you, and which can save your souls; put the word into practice, and be not content to hear it, abusing yourselves with false reasonings" (I. 21-22). This "word" is no other than that of which the Apostles were ministers (*Acts* VI. 4; XIII. 49); and for which the faithful are persecuted (*Matt.* XIII. 21); it is the new faith. The Word, in fact, the Word of God which the sower sows, is not merely the Law and the Prophets of the Old Testament, but the message of Christ, which is the food of these Churches of Judæa, and sets them apart from Judaism; and this message of Christ consists of the treasure of His discourses.[1]

Since Jesus did not write, we at first feel some disquiet at the thought that His words were only preserved in an oral tradition which remained unwritten for many years.

Some critics, who cannot be accused of being "unscrupulous apologists," have answered this difficulty. Rénan, for instance, writes: "It has been observed a thousand times that the strength of the memory is in inverse proportion to the practice of writing. We have a difficulty in imagining what could be retained in the memory in times when hearers did not rely on the notes they had taken or the books they had in their possession. The memory was then like a book." [2] Rénan cites in confirmation the opening of the

[1] Stanton, Vol. II, p. 61. [2] Rénan, *Les Évangiles*, p. 77.

Parmenides of Plato. These arguments have lost so little of their force that they are repeated by Weiss, who shows how much fresher and more practised was the memory of those simple people than that of our "children of the age of paper." [1]

We can point to a much nearer analogy than Plato. As a matter of fact, the Jewish scribes and Rabbis took as their golden rule of teaching that the disciple should listen to the master and repeat his maxims with the most perfect accuracy. "The good disciple," they were fond of saying, "is like a cistern built of concrete, which does not lose one drop." And when they wished to praise a Rabbi, such as R. Jochanan ben Zakkai, they said of him: "He never uttered a word that he had not heard from his master." The *Pirke Aboth*, or *Decisions of the Fathers*, is a collection of sayings from some sixty famous Rabbis of the first and second century of our era; and it will give us some idea of the pains taken by Palestinian Jews to preserve the words of the wise. The whole *Mishna* is nothing more than a written account of the oral teaching of the Rabbis. It is manifest that the teaching of Jesus was incomparably above that of the "doctors of the Law" of His day, in wealth, brilliancy, and freedom; but the attitude of the disciples, who gave Jesus the title of Rabbi, would have been that of most docile and faithful learners.[2] Humanly speaking, this gives us the value of oral tradition.

To this we must add that this oral tradition was

[1] J. Weiss, *Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 54.

[2] J. Weiss, Vol. I, p. 54; Dalman, p. 276.

not preserved in the memory of some one hearer or another of the first hour, but in whole communities throughout Palestine, in which the faithful were in the closest union, and where great numbers had heard the Master together, so that the memory of one would control that of the rest, and where the sovereign part played by the "Word of the Lord" made it imperative that there should be no doubt about its authenticity and literal accuracy.

I will venture on another argument. The discourses of Jesus in the Synoptics are not properly sermons, but rather a series of sentences. It would be unreasonable on our part to imagine the Divine Master striving to say something new each day. On the contrary, He would have taken pains to repeat Himself, so that He might better impress upon His disciples, "His children," as He calls them, the doctrines of which they were to be the depositories and missionaries. The "Sermon on the Mount" is a model of such a discourse, and it is a recapitulation. We have to acknowledge that the memory of those who do not read is more practised than with us who do; but, on the other hand, the teaching of those who do not write what they teach must be adapted to these conditions and provide against the risks.[1]

[1] We are not the first to recognize these conditions. J. Touzard, *Le livre d'Amos* (Paris, 1909), p. xlii: "It is easy to picture to ourselves that, after proclaiming the oracles and commenting on them to the people, the prophet would have made a concise abridgment for the use of his disciples, which they would preserve as a precious deposit, and which they, in their turn, would repeat to anyone who desired it. It is from these summaries, or part of them, that this little book was com-

St. Paul was a writer, and he could thus give his teaching that difficult style we find in the Epistle to the Romans; the Gospels, on the contrary, needed to be cast in a very simple form, in order that it should be perfectly preserved. Thus Divine simplicity subjected itself to traditional rules.

Whereto shall I compare[1] the men of this generation? and what do they resemble?

They resemble little children sitting in a public place and saying one to another:

We have played the flute for you,
and you have not danced;
we have sung laments for you,
and you have not wept (*Luke* VII. 31-32; *Matt.* XI. 16-17).

These children gravely sitting in a public place are not at play, but in class; they sing in two choirs, answering one another. Observe the refrain: short, neatly-set phrases, with exact, symmetrical antithesis. We have here, at its best, the characteristics of Hebrew poetry, perceptible in all the poetical writings of the Bible, such as the Psalms or Proverbs.

Judge not;
that you may not be judged.
With the judgment with which you judge,
you shall be judged;
And with the measure with which you measure,
it shall be measured unto you (*Matt.* VII. 1-2).

posed, which should show to future ages the activity of Amos; this is no doubt the cause of the artificial character of the grouping and of the fragmentary state of many elements in its constitution. Hence also comes the literary form in which they are clothed."

[1] With regard to this phrase, see below, p. 174.

Ask, and it shall be given unto you ;
seek, and ye shall find ;
knock, and it shall be opened to you.
For he who asketh, receiveth ;
and he who seeketh, findeth,
and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened (*Matt.* VII. 7-8).

Be prudent as serpents,
and simple as doves (*Matt.* X. 16).

There is nothing hidden,
that shall not be discovered,
nothing secret,
that shall not be known.
What I tell you in darkness,
tell it in full day ;
and what is said in your ear,
preach it upon the house-tops (*Matt.* X. 26-27).

Love your enemies,
do good to him that hateth you ;
bless him that curseth you,
pray for him that ill-treateth you (*Luke* VI. 27-28).

Jesus thus uses what I may venture to call a mnemonic form, the better to impress His doctrine upon His lowly hearers, without at the same time failing to arrest the attention of the more educated and refined. Jesus, besides, does not confine Himself to this aphoristic manner, which might easily become rather dry. He is not content with saying: "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth;" this maxim is enclosed in a short development, in which we can still observe the regular and marked antithesis :—

When thou givest an alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as do the hypocrites in the synagogues and the streets, to

be glorified by men. I tell you, they have received their reward.

But when thou givest an alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth, and let thine alms be secret. And thy Father, who seeth in secret, will reward thee.

And corresponding to this :—

When thou prayest, be not like the hypocrites, who love to pray standing in the synagogues and at the corners of the streets, to be seen by men. I tell you, in truth, they have received their reward.

But when thou prayest, enter into thy chamber, and, having closed the door, pray to thy Father in secret. And thy Father, who seeth in secret, will reward thee (*Matt.* VI. 2-6).

The precept of alms-deeds and prayer, and still more the precept of secrecy in alms-deeds and prayer, in sight of our heavenly Father alone, who sees in secret, is presented with such contrast, and stands out in such relief, that it can never be forgotten.

When He desires to inculcate some idea, the Saviour does not hesitate to give it a certain extreme measure, so as to have the appearance of paradox, if I may venture to say so. Such is the maxim told us by St. Mark :—

Children, how difficult it is to enter the kingdom of God ! It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God (*Mark* X. 24-25).

We can compare this to other maxims :—

If thy right eye scandalize thee, tear it out and cast it far from thee . . .

and if thy right hand scandalize thee, cut it off and cast it far from thee . . . (*Matt.* V. 29-30).

And also with the maxims on anxiety about food and clothing :—

Regard the birds of the air, they do not sow, nor do they reap, nor gather into barns, and your heavenly Father feedeth them. . . .

Regard the lilies of the field how they grow ; they work not, neither do they spin, yet Solomon in all his glory was not clothed as one of these. . . .

Be not therefore troubled, and say not: what shall we eat? what shall we drink? wherewith shall we be clothed? . . . Seek first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you (*Matt.* VI. 26-33).

The paradoxical appearance was given to these thoughts in order that they might strike those who heard them for the first time, and it is from the Master alone that they could have received such a form.

What we have said of these maxims is still more fulfilled in the tales; they bear the stamp of perfection. In such a parable as that of the sower, it can be said that there is no word missing, and no word too much; everything is apt and in its place, and the thought underlying the tale is clearness itself. Oral tradition cannot have lost nor interpolated anything. If we make a "harmony" of the Synoptics, and compare their verbal differences, we find that these are so slight that we have no difficulty in reconstructing the original form. "And here we confirm the universal experience that what has once been said in a perfect manner can never be defaced or lost." [1]

[1] J. Weiss, Vol. I, p. 55. Compare Reinach, *Revue historique*, January, 1910, p. 186, in answer to the pointed and ironical criticism of Loisy: "I refuse to consider as historical a report of the discourses of Jesus, founded, to take things at

II.

We have just examined the conditions connected with oral tradition, and have seen the special guarantees it gives for the Gospel we receive through it. The internal study of the Gospel will add still more direct authenticity to the sayings contained in it.

A moment ago I called your attention to the literary form of certain sayings, as favouring their preservation by oral tradition. We might ask if Jesus constantly used this rather artificial form, or whether His speech had not, on the contrary, a freedom and simplicity far removed from this sapiential style. Whatever may be the answer to this question, the Divine "Pedagogue" knew that this "sapiential" style would help His disciples to remember His words; let us then bless Him for having condescended to give His words this stamp, at the same time a mark of originality and of authenticity.

Merely from the quotations we have already made from these *logia*, arranged in short parallel phrases with definite antithesis, you will have realized that the language of Jesus would appear strange to a Greek. But amongst educated Jews this style was a form of speech derived from past ages. The maxims of the Rabbis, preserved in the *Pirke Aboth*, are wanting in that symmetry, purity, and variety of design which impressed the crowds on hearing Jesus,

their best, on the recollections of illiterate men." Poor hearers of the Gospel! They cannot gain credit with Mr. Reinach, because they have not obtained "certificates of proficiency" from the Primary School Inspector of Tiberias!

and made them observe that He did not speak like the scribes. He was called "the Prophet" as much for His sayings as for His miracles; since the former truly recalled the manner of the prophets, but with more sweetness of tone, more familiarity and suppleness of style, but just as poetical, in the Jewish meaning of the word.

Parallelism and antithesis are native to Hebrew poetry, and we have seen what part both of these played in the speech of the Saviour.

We will now turn our attention to another style, even more popular and simple, if I may be allowed to say so. It consists, not in antithesis, but in repetition:—

No one placeth a piece of unbleached cloth [1] in an old cloak,
for it will draw the whole cloak, and the rent will become worse.
And no one putteth new wine into old leather bottles, for
the bottles will burst, and the wine flow out (and the bottles be
lost) (*Matt.* IX. 16-17).

Give not the holy thing to the dogs,
cast not your pearls before swine,
lest they trample them under foot,
and, turning, they tear you to pieces (*Matt.* VII. 6).[2]

One last example:—

No one can serve two masters.
For either he will hate the one and love the other,

[1] *ῥάκους ἀγνάφου*, cloth straight from the loom, which has not been in the hands of the fuller.

[2] It is supposed that the word "holy (thing)"—(*τὸ ἅγιον*) represents the Aramaic word for "jewel." We may also suppose that "they tear you to pieces" (*στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν ὑμᾶς*) refers to the dogs and not to the swine.

or he will cling to the one and despise the other.
You cannot serve God and Mammon (*Matt.* VI. 24).[1]

Some push the search for "poetic" style in the Gospels so far as to find throughout some arrangement of a strophic character, and the verses I have given above are cited as examples.[2] We need not go to such lengths, but this much appears fully established: the literary style of the Gospel sentences is easily recognizable as neither Greek nor Rabbinical, but of an older Jewish style, though employed by Jesus with royal liberty: and its value would hardly be perceptible to a Greek.

The second mark of authenticity is the language of Jesus. We have already anticipated this argument several times, so that I have some diffidence in again insisting on it, but it is a necessary part of our argument here. Jesus, as we have said, spoke Aramaic, and the discourses in our Gospels are merely a translation into Greek, and that a more or less impure Greek, since the Greek of Mark is very inferior to that of Luke or Matthew. No doubt the Greek spoken in Judæa and the greater part of Syria was impregnated with Semitic traits; but the fact still remains that, in our Synoptics, the speech of Jesus is conceived and constructed as Semitic speech, and it has been boldly said: "It is Aramaic clothed in Greek."[3] And in acknowledging this we also

[1] Commentators notice that the Aramaic word *mamona* is a common noun meaning wealth or riches. The Evangelist, in translating this maxim into Greek, makes it into a proper noun, *Mammon*, as if it referred to a kind of deity like *Plutus*.

[2] J. Weiss, Vol. I, p. 57.

[3] J. Weiss, Vol. I, p. 57; Dalman, p. 13.

recognize the fidelity of the Greek translation.[1] A Greek scholar who has never studied Semitic, and who is not alive to the Semitic features of the Gospel, runs the risk at one time of losing the simplicity of the text, and at others the delicate shades of meaning. Sometimes difficulties are solved by restoring the supposed original Aramaic;[2] and some enigmatical phrases are explained as being a play upon words in the Aramaic which it was impossible to reproduce in the Greek.[3]

[1] See Dalman, p. 16, for specimens of the Aramaisms in the Gospel. I will instance: The reinforcement of the verb by its own noun: *ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα* (*Luke* xxii. 15); *ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην* (*Matt.* ii. 10). So that the expression of Bossuet, "Dormez votre sommeil," is an Aramaism. So again is the expression *ἐν τῷ* with an infinitive; the expressions *καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐγένετο δέ*; the copulas *εὐθέως, εὐθύς, παραχρῆμα*; the construction *ἤρξατο, ἤρξαντο* with the infinitive; the verb with a participle in apposition, *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, καθίσας ἐδίδαξεν, ἐρχόμενος ἤγγισεν* (Wellhausen, pp. 18-34).

[2] For instance: "Let the dead bury their dead" (*Matt.* viii. 22). Prof. Guidi, of the University of Rome, has kindly confirmed my recollection of a former conversation: "The interpretation of *Matt.* viii. 22 was suggested to me by Neubauer, who sees a play upon the words מתא (*matha*), a village; and מתא (*mętha*), death. The sense being that the inhabitants of the village would bury the father, since it was a duty to bury all dead bodies that were found." Wellhausen, p. 36, gives other examples.

[3] If we may believe certain critics, we can cite as an example the words of the Saviour: "If they have called the master of the house (*τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην*) Beelzebul, how much more those of his household (*οἰκιακοὺς αὐτοῦ*)?" (*Matt.* x. 25). The Aramaic for "master of the house" was *Beelzebul*, while the devil was called *Beelzebub*, after a Phœnician god.—The words

The third mark of authenticity is the local colouring. One of the chief characteristics of the style of Jesus is to be found in His figures of speech. Now a figure is a transposition or metaphor, by means of which we express a moral or spiritual thought through a concrete reality which belongs to the daily experience of our hearer. Hence the metaphors we use reveal the circumstances in which we live. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, compares the Christian life to the races in the Stadium: and to the self-denial required from the athlete. He writes: "In the races of the Stadium, all run, but only one receiveth the prize: run ye in the same manner, that ye may receive. He that desireth to wrestle, abstaineth from all things; and they indeed for a perishable crown, but we for an imperishable one" (1 *Cor.* IX. 24-25). Such figures as these recall the Greek life of the great cities, like Corinth, full of distractions and public games. Paul also has a taste for figures borrowed from military life: he compares the life of a Christian to an enlistment; the Christian must put on a complete suit of armour, and bears the "panoply of God:" the buckler of faith, to ward off the "fiery darts" of the enemy (*Eph.* VI. 13-16).[1]

There is nothing of all this in the language of the Gospel, where the figures are taken from the experiences of lowly people who live far from Greek amusements and Roman garrisons. We can restore without

"Cephas thou art Cephas" is much more surely a play upon words, and that in Aramaic.

[1] E. Buonaiuti, *Saggi*, p. 137. "Le metafore di S. Paulo" (from Ramsay and Howson).

effort the little Galilean world, narrow and poor, to which Jesus chose to address Himself. He speaks to masters and servants of their seed-time and harvest, of their vines and granaries, their boats and nets, their wages and debts, their sheep and fig-trees; of the sky that reddens at sunset, and of the lamp which lights up the whole of the poor man's dwelling. There is not a false note in the harmony, not a figure taken from a strange or foreign medium.

The fourth mark of authenticity is the allusions to contemporary events. Persons are named without introduction, such as Pharisees, scribes, or priests; so also all references to Jewish institutions or customs are left unexplained. Pharisees come to Jesus and tell Him: "Go, depart from hence, for Herod seeketh to kill Thee." And Jesus answers them: "Go and tell that fox: Behold, I drive out devils and I cure the sick to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall have ended . . ." (*Luke* XIII. 31-32). So curt a statement is only possible in the time of Herod. They spoke to Jesus "of the Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices," and "of the eighteen upon whom the tower of Siloe fell and killed them," two events otherwise unknown, but which are in the minds of all at the moment when they referred to them.

A fifth mark of authenticity in the sayings of Jesus is that they deal with adversaries who only had power at that moment. Read the discourses in St. Matthew against the scribes and Pharisees who sit in the chair of Moses, who spread out their phylacteries and the fringes of their mantles, who love the first places in

the synagogues and at feasts, and who are saluted in public places with the title of Rabbi; who swear by the gold of the Temple without considering themselves bound, and who are fair as whitewashed sepulchres (*Matt.* XXIII. 1-31). And remember that this society disappeared with the Holy City. After A.D. 70 the Pharisees are no longer a power, but become the embodiment of human misery for all future ages; but in the Gospel times they were a living and hostile organization.

III.

The Greek word *parabolē*, which corresponds to the Jewish *mashal*, signifies a comparison whose object is to throw light upon some precept or maxim by a concrete example. Generalizations and abstract ideas were repugnant to the Semitic mind; and in order to appeal to it, it was necessary to speak in a style suited to it, which consisted in a constant translation of the abstract into figures and of the universal into particular examples. The word *mashal* implies the question: "What is this like?" and its answer. It is not a mere ornament, quite the contrary; it is rather a most insinuating and didactic form of speech. We must, however, give the word *parable* a meaning sufficiently wide to include a simple saying, such as "Physician, heal thyself," and at the same time a complete narrative like the story of the poor man Lazarus. The distinction between apologue and allegory, so sharply defined from one another in Greek rhetoric, is foreign to

the Semitic genius, which freely amalgamates the two.[1]

The parable, thus understood, did not need inventing in Gospel times. The Old Testament, in fact, has several, such as the vine in Isaias (*Is.* v. 2-7), or better still, the parable of the ewe-lamb, addressed by the prophet Nathan as a lesson to King David (2 *Sam.* XII. 1-4).

The Rabbis of the first century of our era made use of parables, as we learn from recent research; and some interesting examples can be studied. I must confess that those quoted from the schools of Hillel and Shammai, two Rabbis contemporary with the Gospel, are rather vague.[2] Gamaliel, the master of St. Paul, compares his disciples to fish of different kinds; this is still vague, though it reminds us of the Gospel parable of the net. The following is one of the parables attributed to R. Jochanan ben Zakkai (a contemporary of the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70). He had lost his son, and R. Eleazar ben Arakh tries to console him by saying :—

I will tell you (a parable):
What is this like?

[1] This statement is the result of a series of recent investigations made by Fiebig and Wellhausen, who correct the over-systematic work of Jülicher. The latter, in his *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 1899, popularized by Loisy, *Études évangéliques*, 1902, declared against the authenticity of all Gospel parables in which is to be found any allegorical element. See Lagrange, "La parabole en dehors de l'Évangile," *Revue biblique*, 1909, pp. 198, 342. *Orpheus* has no word to say about the Gospel parables.

[2] Lagrange, p. 357.

It is like to a man to whom the king gave a charge. Each day he weepeth, saying: Woe is me, when shall I be free from this charge and at peace?

Thus it is with thee, O Rabbi, Thou hadst a son, who studied the Torah [the Law, or the Bible in general], the Lesson [the five books of Moses in particular], the Prophets, the Writings [the hagiographical books], the Halachoth and the Haggadoth [juridical or pious commentaries on the Bible]; and he hath gone out of the world without sin. Thou canst console thyself, for thou hast given back thy charge intact.

And R. Jochanan ben Zakkai said to him: My son, thou hast consoled me as men console.[1]

This *mashal* is interesting, first because it reveals the soul of the scribe, penetrated with fear of God, and filled with pedantry; then because of the setting, indicated rather than developed; lastly, because of the introduction of a king, a familiar person in parables, and of a treasure left in charge which is also used in the Gospel, since it belonged to the daily experience of the Jews.[2] Fiebig calls our attention to the formula with which the *mashal* opens: "What is this like?" It is, he says, the stereotyped formula in Tannaite literature (i.e. the literature of the Rabbis and the Mishna). We find the same formula in the Gospel (*Matt.* XIII. 45; *Luke* XIII. 18-19; *Mark* IV. 30-31). Fiebig also notices the ellipses in the above parable. Features remain unfinished, unsymmetrical and abrupt: this is what Fiebig calls "Inkonzinnität," and he describes it as a characteristic of Jewish psychology. It is a mistake, he concludes, to

[1] Fiebig, "Jüdische Gleichnisse der neutestamentlichen Zeit," in the *Zeitschrift für die neut. Wissenschaft*, 1909, p. 302.

[2] Lagrange, p. 362.

criticize the Gospel parables from the Greek standpoint.

R. Jochanan ben Zakkai said once more:

This is like to a king who invited his servants to a feast, but did not appoint the time. The wise amongst them robed themselves, and sat themselves down at the door of the king's house. The foolish amongst them went about their occupations. They said: Is there a feast without trouble [without time being taken to prepare]? Suddenly the king called his servants. The wise went in before him robed as they were; and the foolish went in before him unadorned as they were. The king rejoiced at seeing the wise, but he was angry at seeing the foolish. He said: Those who are prepared for the feast may sit, and eat and drink; those who are unprepared for the feast may stand, and wait and look on.[1]

This parable will remind you of the five wise and five foolish virgins, and also of the man who went to the feast without the festal garment. Fiebig does not consider that either R. Jochanan or the Gospel owe anything to each other, and that the coincidence is due to the fact that they both speak to the Jews of the same period, of the same surroundings, and the same mental horizon. This is not the only coincidence: we can call in evidence two parables ascribed to R. Gamaliel II (between A.D. 90-150). In the former Gamaliel is disputing with a philosopher about the gods of paganism. The philosopher points out that at a recent fire their temple alone was spared. Gamaliel replies:—

I will tell thee a parable:
What is this like?
It is like to a king of flesh and blood who goeth to war.

[1] Fiebig, p. 304.

With whom will he engage in combat? with the living or with the dead?

The philosopher: With the living.

R. Gamaliel on another occasion said:—

He who hath an occupation, what is he like?

He is like to a vineyard well fenced in, where neither domestic animals nor wild beasts can enter, nor can those eat who pass by, nor can glances penetrate.

And he who hath not an occupation, what is he like?

He is like to a vineyard which hath a breach, where domestic animals and wild beasts can enter, and those can eat who pass by, and glances can penetrate.[1]

The parable is essentially an explanation, and must be capable of being understood, without itself needing explanation. This is still more true of exegetical parables, which are set before us in order to illustrate some text of the Bible or some precept of the Law. Fiebig has no difficulty in acknowledging that the Rabbinical parables fail of being natural and show a want of inventive power. The types and subjects are mostly taken from the hard and bitter Jewish life of the cities. Hillel speaks of the statues of kings set up in theatres and circuses! We soon begin to appreciate the freshness, the simple grace and the variety in the Gospel parables. The Rabbis and the Gospel both employ the same literary style so dear to the Jews, only the examples in the Gospel are incomparably superior.

[1] Lagrange, p. 358. The same author cites (*ibid.*) a parable of R. Aqiba: "I will tell thee a parable. What is this like? It is like to a fox who walketh by the shore of a river, and seeth the fishes who gather together, and he saith to them: . . ." The Gospel never gives speech to beasts or plants.

The parable was so thoroughly Jewish and Palestinian, that it did not take root when transplanted on to Greek soil; there is not one single parable to be found in the whole early Christian literature. What is more astonishing is that the Apostles, although immediate disciples of Jesus, and Galileans, have not attempted to imitate Him in teaching by means of parables. We might say that henceforth this style was set apart, and that as the Divine Master was incomparably above the Rabbis of the first century, so also even His disciples could not imitate Him.

He set before them another parable and He said:

The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man who sowed good seed in his field. But while the people were asleep, his enemy came and sowed cockle amongst the wheat, and went his way. When the herb grew up and gave its fruit, then appeared also the cockle. The servants of the master of the house coming to him, said: Master, didst thou not sow good seed in thy field? Whence then cometh the cockle? And he answered them: An enemy hath done this. And the servants said to him: Desirest thou that we go and gather it? And he said to them: No, lest that in gathering up the cockle, you root up the wheat also. Let both grow until the harvest, and, at the time of the harvest, I will say to the reapers: Gather up first the cockle, and bind it into bundles to burn, but the wheat gather ye into my barn (*Matt.* XIII. 24-30).[1]

These pure and sober lines are taken from St.

[1] Rose, *Mathieu*, p. 108: "Cockle, identified as *Lolium temulentum*, is very like wheat in its earlier stages of growth. When it matures, the grain turns black, and can easily be distinguished from grains of corn. They are supposed to be poisonous, and have an injurious effect both on the stomach and the brain." Cockle is called ζιζάνια in Greek. This word has passed into the Vulgate, and thence into French.

Matthew, who here surpasses the most finished efforts of St. Luke. It is a comparison taken from nature and life. There is nothing from beginning to end which is beyond the experience of field labourers: tillage, sowing, harvest, wheat and cockle, bundles and barns. Then the shadowy outline of the enemy, on the watch, nameless, not to be identified; the resignation of the master, who knows by whom the wrong has been done, but who can do nothing at the moment to set things right; we must wait for the harvest when the cockle will be burned and the wheat stored up. We must not seek here for the dry unities of the Greek fable; notice rather how the subject is developed at every step: the enemy is no longer the jealous or vindictive peasant, but the type of wicked and incorrigible humanity; the field of corn becomes at the same time the world and the kingdom of God *in fieri*, and, lastly, the final harvest is the harvest of the heavenly Father. A figure coloured to attract the Oriental, and clear thoughts to delight the Western mind.[1] But, still better, it is a moral lesson, penetrating in proportion to its restraint. That sower of the cockle is eternally human, and we feel how Jesus speaks to us of that which we have suffered most deeply, consoling us by the patient wisdom of the master of the house, and also by the thought of the justice to be dealt out at the harvest-time. And all this is set before us with a supreme simplicity which has no shadow of literary parade. There is something inimitable in the Gospel; it is not Homeric, nor Virgilian, nor Racinean but Evan-

[1] Jülicher, quoted by Loisy, *Études évangéliques*, p. 67.

gelic. And this inimitable style is the last mark of authenticity.

IV.

In order that I may sum up this lecture without repeating myself, allow me to quote, from a critic whose independence is patent to all,[1] the conclusions which force themselves upon us.

After saying what he rejects from the Synoptics, he writes: "Not only as books of religious edification, but also as authorities for the history of Jesus," the Synoptics are of incomparable value. Modern Jews, under pretext that something similar is to be found in the Talmud, try to belittle the sayings of Jesus as found in the Synoptics; saying that they are "rays of light" borrowed from "the far richer wisdom of the Rabbis."[2] Their efforts are as unreasonable as the theory of a fanatical critic who considers these sayings as the residue of the ideals and aspirations of the first three generations of Christians,[3] so that he makes the Jesus of the Synoptics into a mere personi-

[1] Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 372 (328).

[2] We should have been surprised if we had not found this old-fashioned error in *Orpheus*. It is to be seen there, p. 232 (341): "It is true that Christian morality is no more original than is any other . . . it is that of the contemporary Jewish schoolmen, of a Hillel or a Gamaliel." *Orpheus* adds immediately: "But it appears (in the Gospels) divested of all scholasticism and ritualistic pedantry, robust and simple as befits a doctrine setting forth to conquer the world." Fine writing!

[3] Another error of *Orpheus*, p. 232 (342): "It is the morality of a school without a school, purified and distilled in ardent souls, with all the charm and all the persuasive force of popular conceptions." More fine writing!

fication of the piety of the Christian sect. No, the parables contained in the Synoptics would of themselves be enough to compel our acceptance of a personal origin, not because parables are a creation of Jesus, but because "the mass of homogeneous parables alone, which we find in the Synoptics, compels us to fall back upon a single personality as the author of a mode of teaching not elsewhere adopted at this time, or at least not in the same way." I must again insist that Jülicher does not regard the Gospels as we do. Like Harnack, Weiss, or Wellhausen, he submits them to the criterion of his free judgment; he takes one thing and leaves another, according to his own critical verdict. But at the same time his criticisms do not sweep away everything. What prevails with him is that: "There lies in all Synoptic Logia a kernel of individual character so inimitable and so fresh that their authenticity is raised above all suspicion. Jesus must have spoken just as the Synoptics make Him speak, when He roused the people from their torpor, when He . . . lovingly stooped to their needs, when He revealed to His disciples His inmost thoughts about His message of the Kingdom, when He . . . gave them laws, when He contended fiercely with the hostile Pharisees and Sadducees, or worsted them by force of reasoning:— for no otherwise can we explain the world-convulsing influence gained by so short a life's work." [1]

Such a verdict is the minimum for us, Gentlemen, and you will understand me in that light; but this

[1] Jülicher, p. 372 (328). So also J. Weiss, *Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 65.

minimum is that of an independent critic, although one who measures his statements ; you can therefore judge the quality of another critic, Schmiedel, who affirms that there are in the Gospels *nine* authentic passages from Jesus; while Salomon Reinach, not to be outdone, adds that "We could even dispute these." [1]

[1] *Revue historique*, Vol. CIII (1910), p. 187.

THE HISTORIC CERTAINTY OF THE GOSPEL STORY.

(1 May, 1910.)

Gentlemen,

The guarantee of authenticity which criticism rightly gives to the words of Jesus preserved in the Gospel, already decides a considerable portion of the last question we have to discuss, namely, the historic certainty of the Person and actions of Jesus. The parables, sayings, and answers which the Gospels report concerning Jesus, reveal, in fact, Jesus Himself, the quality of His teaching, and above all, the consciousness He has of Who He is. The authentic Word of Jesus is Jesus Himself, the incomparable Master, creator of spirit and life as none other in the world ever was, united to the Father by an unique Sonship; regarding the death for which He offers Himself as a supreme mission and as a ransom; extending His preaching, which He knows is but for a short time, by the commission given to His disciples, to whom He promises permanency;—these are some of the features drawn from the Gospel word, and they are so many traits of the personality of Jesus.

In talking to you to-night of the historic certainty

of the actions of the Divine Master, after having established the authenticity of His teaching, I have therefore not so much to prove a new thesis, as to dispute the previous question raised by rationalists, and to disprove the reasons they bring forward for asserting that the supernatural Christ of our faith, and also of the faith of the Evangelists, is an unreal, transfigured being, distinct from the historic Jesus of Nazareth.

I.

Critics who insist that the Gospel story should be merely natural can no longer reject the whole narrative as legend, under pretext that it is full of miracle and the supernatural. Scholars have abandoned the principle that a miraculous account is necessarily an imposture, or at least the outcome of a myth ; it does not imply a long interval of time between the moment when the miracle is supposed to have happened and the moment when it was written down, as if a miracle was only accepted gradually. Harnack has uttered the following advanced opinion : "The habit of condensing a narrative, or of ascribing it to a later age, only because it includes stories of miracles, is a piece of prejudice."[1] Historians of the strictest schools to-day construct the history of the early middle ages most scientifically from documents which are full of miracles. St. Augustine affirms that in his diocese of Hippo he knows of seventy miraculous cures worked by St. Stephen at a shrine which had only been in existence two years at the time he wrote,

[1] *What is Christianity ?* (ed. Franc. 1902), p. 26 (28).

yet no one suspects the authenticity of this chapter in the *City of God*, nor is the good faith of the Saint called in question; critics do not even doubt the material truth of the facts alleged by this great and learned Doctor.[1] Similarly, St. Luke, in one of the passages of the Acts in which he uses the term *we* (*Acts* XXVIII. 8-10), reports the cure by St. Paul of the father of his host Publius at Malta. Luke was there and he reports what he saw.[2] The rationalists of to-day, without believing more of the supernatural than before, do not dispute the material fact of cures which we believe to be miraculous;[3] or at least they no longer condemn the Evangelists as unhistorical solely because they report such things. It has been said with truth that: "Historical science in this last generation has taken a great step in advance by learning to pass a more intelligent and benevolent judgment on those narratives [our Gospels], and accordingly even reports of the marvellous can now be counted amongst the materials of history and turned to good account."[4]

[1] August. *Civ. Dei*, XXII. 8 (ed. Hoffman, Vol. II, p. 608). Cf. Dom Butler, *The Lausiac History of Palladius* (Cambridge, 1898), p. 192; Stanton, Vol. II, p. 3.

[2] Harnack, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 124.

[3] P. Wernle, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion* (Tübigen, 1901), p. 26. *Orpheus*, p. 225 (331), rejects the miraculous cures reported by the Gospels. But p. 92 (137), we find: "Long inscriptions discovered at Epidaurus describe a great number of cures obtained by sick persons, thanks to the nocturnal intervention of Asklepios and the animals proper to his worship, the dog, the serpent, and the goose."

[4] Harnack, *What is Christianity?* p. 24 (26).

No historian would now write: "The Gospels . . . are documents which cannot be utilized for a history of the real life of Jesus."[1] As a general statement, no document is incapable of being utilized by the historian. History (and what are we to say of prehistory?) is constructed out of all kinds of materials, fragments of sculptured monuments, *graffiti*, official inscriptions, coins, scraps of papyrus, and broken *ostraka;* with the texts of historians and even the verses of poets; there is a hierarchy of documents that is all.

The eye-witness who relates what he has seen or heard passes for a model of veracity; Cæsar, in writing his commentaries, would in that case be the best of historians. Yet Tacitus wrote the history of the reign of Tiberius (A.D. 14-37) seventy-five years after the death of that emperor—and he makes use of previous historians, and even appeals to unwritten tradition.[2] Without being an eye-witness, Tacitus is still accepted as a truthful historian. Critics will weigh his assertions and calculate their value, but they will deal in the same manner with Cæsar. A narrative can therefore be true, although not told by an eye-witness.[3] Even if we suppose the Gospel

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 223 (328).

[2] Tacit. *Annales*, III. 16: "Audire me memini ex senioribus. . . ." Fabia, *Les sources de Tacite*, p. 345.

[3] *Orpheus*, p. 216 (318): "Not one of the Gospels is by an eye-witness;" p. 220 (323): "We now perceive that Luke was not an eye-witness, and that our Matthew and Mark are not the narratives of eye-witnesses, but are based upon records no longer in existence." This would be exactly the case with

according to St. Matthew not to be by an immediate disciple of Jesus called Matthew, still the three Synoptical Gospels must not be ranked lower in the hierarchy of documents than Tacitus, who wrote, about A.D. 110, the story of Tiberius; and I believe that from a purely critical point of view they are to be placed far above him, since they are earlier than A.D. 70; they belong to the generation contemporary with the events they describe, and are written by those who lived in the same surroundings.

In order that the Gospels should be of such value, it is not necessary that they should have been intended as deliberate contributions to history. They were not written purely and simply *ad narrandum*, but (even in the case of St. Luke) *ad euangelizandum*, with the object of propagating faith in Christ and of continuing His ministry by narrating it. The Gospels have fixed in writing a form of Apostolic preaching, and, as the Apostles in their preaching acted the part of witnesses, we find that their preaching was essentially historical. We must not ascribe to the Synoptics, (to say nothing of St. John), complicated personal "tendencies," and systematic mental reservations, as was the fashion with a recent critic, who says of St. Matthew: "If Taine had been born in those times and in that country, and had been a Christian, it is not impossible, perhaps, that he should have conceived and composed the history of Jesus in a manner analogous to that of Matthew."[1] We

Tacitus, for (as to the reign of Tiberius) he is not an eye-witness, but bases his account upon records no longer in existence.

[1] Nicolardot, p. 113.

must not thus modernize and denaturalize the Gospels; they are to be taken as they stand, strangers to ancient rules of history, remarkably indifferent to rhetoric[1] and chronology, or, to speak more accurately, without any data from which to fix their chronology. We must not be surprised to find the life of the Saviour without fixed dates, when the history of the primitive community of Jerusalem and of the oldest mission in Judæa is equally wanting in this respect.[2] One thing only was of importance to the Evangelists, which was that their accounts should be vouched for; and this care on their part is the only thing of importance to critics (if they do not, like ourselves, believe in their inspiration). It is quite a secondary matter that exegetists should have some trouble in harmonizing the statements of the various Evangelists, or even have to despair of doing so for a time.

This want of harmony itself should reassure us, if there were need. The preference of the early Church for the Gospel of St. Matthew should, humanly speaking, have entailed the disappearance of St. Mark's Gospel, and the amalgamation of the third with the first, or at least an effort at retouching and suppressing so as to reconcile discordances in the texts. Nothing of the kind has occurred, for this is one of the rare cases in which the Church had the right to say: We shall know in time. No books, in fact, that have had a very wide circulation (and that of the Gospels has been immense) have ever been

[1] Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*, p. 74.
[2] Harnack, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 32.

interpolated without leaving traces. Textual criticism, in establishing the text of the New Testament more scientifically than any other text in the world, reveals the vicissitudes to which it has been subject; and there is no trace of an effort to make the Gospels harmonize where they are in discord.[1] We know that the heretics of the second century, Marcion for instance, tried to recast the Gospel matter, but in the Catholic Church it was fully recognized that they could not be touched.[2]

Still before this evangelical material was crystallized in our Gospels, might it not have passed through a period of elaboration, so that during twenty or

[1] For the latest results of textual criticism of the Gospels, see *Revue biblique*, 1907, p. 282, where Abel reviews the work of H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des N.T. in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, I, 2 (Berlin, 1906).

[2] The interpolation of the text: "Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in coelo, Pater, Verbum et Spiritus Sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt," in 1 *John* v. 7, is a fact recognized by all theologians of the present time. J. Lebreton, *Origines du dogme de la Trinité*, pp. 524-31: "The verse about the three witnesses . . . appears for the first time in Spain, during the fourth century; and from Spain it spread throughout the Latin world." *Orpheus*, p. 239 (352), speaks of a decree of "the Congregation of the Index" (Reinach confuses the Index and the Holy Office) of 13 January, 1897, forbidding us to "call in doubt the authenticity of the text on the three witnesses." As a matter of fact, this decree was merely a disciplinary measure, which the progress of study, joined to the tacit consent of authorities, has allowed to fall into desuetude. So Lebreton, p. 526. The principle underlying this distinction is well explained by Choupin, *Valeur des décisions doctrinales ou disciplinaires du Saint-Siège* (Paris, 1907), p. 58.

thirty [1] years the faith of the community might have grafted foreign elements on to it? We shall discuss this possibility later, but we desire to say at once that, whatever the coefficient of the faith in the first generation, critics who certainly do not minimize it, such as Jülicher, do not the less recognize the Synoptics (we acknowledge that they only speak of the Synoptics), "not only as books of religious edification, but also as authorities for the history of Jesus" of great value.

Jülicher adds: "Though much of their data may be uncertain, the impression they leave in the reader's mind of the Bearer of Good Tidings is on the whole a faithful one. . . . The true merit of the Synoptics is that . . . they did not repaint, but only handed on, the Christ of history." [2] Even if the stories of miracles had been embroidered, it would still remain a fact that Jesus worked miracles, and that this was the primary explanation of the record. Stories such as the *Talitha cumi* of St. Mark are not poetical inventions. The Jews did not expect a Messiah who should cast Himself on the ground on the Garden of Gethsemane to pray, with a soul sorrowful unto death, amidst His slumbering disciples, with unworthy enemies lying in wait for Him and devoting Him to a cruel torture. Truly such a Messiah is not "the creation of an idealizing fancy," for that fancy would have created something very different. Similarly the picture of Peter denying his Master before cock-crow

[1] And according to the less favourable theory of Jülicher or Weiss, sixty, seventy, or seventy-five years!

[2] Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 371 (328).

is not a phantasy of Christian faith. "And if the total picture of Jesus which we obtain from the Synoptics displays all the magic of reality (in Luke just as much as in Matthew and Mark), this is not the effect of any literary skill—often indeed defective—on the part of the Evangelists, nor is it the result of the poetic and creative power of the authorities lying behind them; but it is rather owing to the fact that they, while modestly keeping their own personalities in the background, painted Jesus as they found Him already existing in the Christian communities, and that this their model corresponded in all essentials to the original. The simplest faith, like the highest art—we learn this from the Synoptists, who drew from the sources of such a faith—has a wonderfully fine perception for the peculiar traits of its hero; in reconstructing the precious image from memory, it flings reflection and the critical faculty aside, it omits much and adds new touches, but it attains at last, in spite of all apparent weakness and caprice, to a picture such as no master of historical writing, though furnished with all the aids of science and initiated into all the technicalities of his craft, can produce in the case of his favourite figures." [1]

[1] Jülicher *Introduction*, p. 374 (331). As to the supposed progression from Mark to Luke or Matthew, see De Grandmaison, *Revue biblique*, 1907, p. 439. He observes that we must on no account understand by this "as certain rationalistic critics, a sublimation due to the naïve faith of the disciples, and attained at the expense of historic truth." This remark holds good against some of the opinions of Jülicher.

In citing the opinions of Jülicher on the historic value of the Gospels, you will understand, without my having to say so, that I make the most absolute reservation on anything by which he limits the veracity of writers whom I hold to be inspired. But where his opinions are in accordance with our own, we have the right to profit by the advantage they give us for saying to a second-hand exegetist like Salomon Reinach that his own authorities renounce him.

We will now turn to Johann Weiss. What, he asks, is the historic value of the Gospel tradition? We measure this value, he replies, by what is characteristic in the features it sets before us. Thus the physiognomy of John the Baptist, thanks only to some fragments of discourses scattered throughout the Gospel, is drawn in so vivid a manner, that we perceive with perfect distinctness the essentials of his personality as contrasted with that of Jesus. So also the Gospel tradition does not give us a characterless portrait of Jesus, a kind of stain-glass window picture; the portrait is drawn in large and bold lines, without anything faint or hesitating; it is "the vigorous picture of an individuality which stands out from its surroundings, and which contrasts in a most decisive fashion with all the personalities known to us in history. If this portrait is merely the expression of the common ideal [of the first Christian generation], we must ask: How then could they have produced such a singular result from their dreams? If this was only the effect of imagination, we must say that the collective faith

has created a personage beyond its own mental horizon."[1]

Jülicher and Johann Weiss are both critics whose independence of spirit no one can contest, and their opinion will be sufficient to support our thesis[2] of the historic value of the "Gospel tradition." Even at this early stage of our investigation, you will appreciate the childishness of an assertion like the following from Salomon Reinach: "It is no more possible to make real history with myths than to make bread with the pollen of flowers. The historic Jesus is essentially intangible, by which I do not mean that He never existed, but simply that we cannot affirm anything about Him, lacking, as we do, all evidence incontestably derived from those who saw and heard Him."[3]

The historic truth of the Gospel, which we have taken as our thesis, implies, for us who believe, the historic truth of the supernatural as well as of the natural, since these cannot, in our eyes, be separated. To rationalistic critics, on the contrary, the natural element alone is real; they believe, with Carlyle, in the value of personality, and they make of the

[1] J. Weiss, *Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 41. So also Harnack, *Das Christentum und die Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1896), p. 16.

[2] W. Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ* (Edinburgh, 1906), p. 266, speaking of eclectic German critics like Weiss and others whom we have cited, says: "It seems to be safe to say that what these men do not question will never be questioned with success. . . . We have, then, I cannot but think, in the criticism of these men an irreducible minimum. And that minimum . . . is an Archimedean point."

[3] *Orpheus*, p. 226 (332).

personality of Jesus a knowable historical person, superior to others, pure amongst the most pure, united to God to the limit to which a human soul is capable, but not beyond this, and without this personality ceasing to belong to the common condition of mankind.[1] Assuredly the extreme scepticism of Salomon Reinach is more defined, and we can see what he denies; in the others, rationalism is fugitive, equivocal at times, making concessions to traditional faith and abandoning its defences. We must clearly understand that if the supernatural is not mentioned, it is still thought of. In fact, there is no other question.[2]

We must then examine the expedients to which critics, whether fair-spoken or not, have recourse in order to eliminate from Gospel history the supernatural element, which appears there in two forms, as miracle and dogma.

II.

When naturalistic critics wish to eliminate some incident from Gospel history, their first expedient is

[1] E. Caird, *The Evolution of Religion* (Glasgow, 1899), Vol. II, p. 230; P. Wernle, *Anfänge unserer Religion*, p. 23; A. Harnack, *What is Christianity?* p. 134 (138).

[2] Lagrange, speaking of Wrede in the *Revue biblique*, 1903, p. 626: "Too often we are told to believe that the conclusions of critics are purely scientific, and that they do not rest upon the denial of the supernatural. . . . Critical reasons are sought out for excluding the supernatural, no doubt, but in the end the same sides are chosen; if the denial of the supernatural is not publicly announced, as the point from which the critic sets out, it is always presupposed as an incontestable principle."

to assert that this so-called historic fact has been suggested by the Old Testament.[1] It is a very specious argument, for it starts from a true observation, which is, that the first Christian generation, and others after them, having to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, invoked the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament and showed that they had been accomplished. Remember the discourses in the Acts. Remember how Philip converted the servant of the Queen of Ethiopia by explaining to him that the text of Isaias which he was reading foretold the Passion (*Acts* VIII. 26-40). Remember Paul, at Cæsarea, in presence of Festus, trying to persuade King Herod-Agrippa II of the Messianic character of Jesus: "Dost thou believe the Prophets, King Agrippa? I know that thou believest them." And Agrippa answers sarcastically: "In a little thou persuadest me to become a Christian" (*Acts* XXVI. 22-9). The Gospel of St. Matthew is characterized by the care that the Evangelist takes to note frequently that this or that fact in Jesus' life was done in order that such and such a word of the Scripture might be fulfilled.[2]

This appeal to the Old Testament, this *typology*, as it is called, is, in our eyes, a series of references, as it were, set in the margin of the narratives. Some recent critics have suggested that the prophetic texts quoted by St. Matthew are from an actual collection of Messianic prophecies drawn up by the first genera-

[1] Jülicher, *Introduction*, p. 310 (266); J. Weiss, *Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 46.

[2] See *Matt.* I. 22, 23; II. 5, 6, 15, 17, 18, 23; III. 3; IV. 14, 16; VIII. 17; XII. 17-21; XIII. 35; XXI. 4, 5; XXVII. 9-10, 35.

tion of the Church.[1] Whether this theory of a supplementary source of Matthew be well founded or no, the prophetic texts do not form an essential part of the Gospel text, but are only marginal references to the prophecies.

Critics like J. Weiss, however, push this argument far, and generalize upon it. Gospel tradition, they think, must have been influenced by this *typology ;* and in many cases the prediction is no longer a commentary on the narrative, but has suggested the latter. The Evangelist believed that to have happened which he thought was predicted. Hence come causes of error, and charges of fiction, which these recent critics have urged against so many texts of the Gospel.

There is not much that need trouble us in all this. As a matter of fact, this insinuation has a very limited range. For, granted that it were well founded, it would only affect a few details in some of the narratives ; no complete story, no episode can be rejected as the mythical projection of a prophecy. The prophetic argument is made up of a mosaic of short texts, which only the reality could have made applicable.

If you wish to see how limited is the effect of a

[1] This little problem is taken up again by Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Vol. II, pp. 342-6. He describes the collection as a "Catena of Fulfilments of Prophecy," and supposes that the original was in Aramaic. The assertion of *Orpheus*, p. 231 (340), that the prophetic texts used were from the Greek version of the Old Testament, need not detain us (Stanton, p. 345).

prophetic text on a detail of a Gospel story, I will cite an example: St. Mark (xv. 23) writes that the executioners offered Jesus, before crucifying Him, some "wine mixed with myrrh." St. Matthew (xxvii. 34) reproduces the same detail, but speaks of "wine mixed with bitter herb." In both texts it is a question of medicated wine, but as myrrh was evidently a resin and not a herb, it is asked why there should be this discrepancy between Mark and Matthew; and it is supposed that Matthew had in his mind a prophetic text from Psalm LXIX. (Vulg. LXVIII.) 22, where the persecuted just man says:—

> For food they gave me bitter herb;[1]
> in my thirst, they gave me to drink of vinegar.

This supposition is plausible, since in certain manuscripts of Matthew the copyist has carried the idea further, by writing *vinegar* in place of *wine*. I pronounce no opinion, but speak only of probabilities; but I say: Granted that the text of the Psalmist influenced the composition of Matthew, what indications are there that this same text inspired Mark to invent an episode so perfectly historical as that of the wine mixed with myrrh, which Jesus refused to drink, —since we know from other sources that it was, in fact, the custom to offer a cordial, perhaps a narcotic, of this kind to condemned persons? Again, if, as J. Weiss supposes, this Psalm LXIX. after being at first read as a prediction of the Passion was afterwards taken as a description of it,[2] why has not the whole

[1] Bitter herb is χολή. In the New Testament of the Vulgate this word is translated *gall*.

[2] J. Weiss, *Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 47.

of the prophecy passed into the traditional account of the Passion?

3. I am fallen into a pit of water,
and the waves submerge me. . . .
12. I take sack-cloth for my garment. . . .
13. Those who are at the gate speak of me,
and the drinkers of strong liquors make their songs of me. . . .

Again in Psalm XXII. we have two verses which have been incorporated with the history of the Passion:—

17. They have pierced my feet and my hands. . . .
19. They have shared my vestments,
and over my tunic they have cast lots. . . .

But why are these not also included?

13. Round about me are many bulls. . . .
16. And all my bones are disjointed. . . .
17. For dogs surround me. . . .
21. Deliver my soul from the sword,
and my life from the power of the dog.

If such highly coloured texts have not attracted attention, does it not prove decisively that the adaptation to prophecy, in the story of the Passion or in any other story of the Gospels, was, in fact, very limited, because this adaptation was subordinated to a previous and definite knowledge of the facts?

The answer we here give to an expedient, as used with some tact by critics like J. Weiss, is of still more force against a writer of the calibre of Reinach, who uses it with all the strength of his arm. After all it is perhaps better to smile at his efforts, as has been very appropriately done by Loisy and Schürer.[1]

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 232 (341): "Unless we insist on using two kinds of weights and measures, we must admit that this verse in

A second expedient of naturalistic critics is to say that the stories of miracles, when they cannot be explained by natural means, are moral tales which have been taken as history, or metaphors which a very primitive simplicity understood literally.

Here, again, we have a very specious argument, since it answers to a possibility which even ecclesiastical exegetists have not wholly repudiated. In this way, some writers think that, as the disciples could only know of the Temptation in the desert from Jesus Himself, He might have described to them, under the form of a parable, the trials which He had to undergo as Messiah and Son of God.[1] The Temptation would in that case be understood as we understand Jesus' words, when He said, on the return of the seventy disciples: "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven" (*Luke* x. 18).

Whatever we may think of this bold supposition,

the psalms *may* be the origin of the tradition which declares that Jesus was crucified. What then remains to us of all the Gospel story, from the stable at Bethlehem to Golgotha?" So also in his *Cultes, mythes et religions*, Vol. II (1906), pp. 436-42. Loisy, *Revue historique*, Vol. CII (1906), p. 313, answers this question very well: "If the crucifixion of Jesus were not attested by contemporaries, but only by texts from long after the event, the psalm *might* be the origin of the tradition in question. But, in the actual state of the evidence, it is idle to put forward such an hypothesis. We might as well deny authority to the whole collection of parables, because it pleased Matthew (XIII. 35) to see in the parabolic teaching the accomplishment of Psalm LXXVIII. (Vulg. LXXVII.), 2." Schürer, in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1906, p. 259.

[1] Rose, *Mathieu*, p. 22. The opposite thesis will be found in Vigouroux-Brassac, Vol. III, p. 324.

we shall not believe that the symbolic interpretation can explain the whole series of miraculous narratives which the Evangelists propose to us as facts;[1] that, for instance, the miraculous draft of fishes was merely a figure of the Apostolic preaching; the stilling of the tempest, of the persecutions of the Church; the cure of the daughter of the Canaanite woman, of the conversion of the Gentiles; and the multiplication of the loaves, of the Christian mystery of the Eucharist. Symbolism is a signification superimposed upon the literal story. Thus the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves becomes an admirable symbol of the Eucharist. There is no doubt, however, that the Evangelists thought only of the actual multiplication, and only wished to recount that miracle, as a simple fact. We can understand that the narrative should have given rise to the symbolism, but not that the symbolism should have given rise to the narrative.[2] Still less can we understand how such symbolism could arise in a medium, a "tradition," to which Alexandrian symbolism and its subtle play was entirely foreign.

"The truth is," says a critic esteemed for his wisdom, "that the historian who tries to construct a reasoned picture of the life of Christ finds that he

[1] Lepin, *La valeur historique du 4me Évangile* (Paris, 1910), for the narratives contained in the fourth Gospel.

[2] *Orpheus*, p. 225 (331): "The miracles attributed to Jesus by evangelical tradition are exorcisms (casting out devils) or allegories (the multiplication of the loaves and fishes, the transformation of water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana)." How is the *Talitha cumi* an exorcism or an allegory?

cannot dispense with miracles. He is confronted with the fact that no sooner had the life of Jesus ended in apparent failure and shame, than the great body of Christians—not an individual here or there, but the mass of the Church—passed over at once to the fixed belief that He was God. By what conceivable process could the men of that day have arrived at such a conclusion, if there had been really nothing in His life to distinguish it from that of ordinary men? We have seen that He did not work the kind of miracles which they expected. The miracles in themselves in any case came short of their expectations. But this makes it all the more necessary that there must have been something about the Life, a broad and substantial element in it, which *they could recognize* as supernatural and Divine—not that we can recognize, but which they could recognize with the ideas of the time. Eliminate miracles from the career of Jesus, and the belief of Christians, from the first moment that we have undoubted contemporary evidence of it (say A.D. 60), becomes an insoluble enigma." [1]

In other words, Gentlemen, in so far as the history of the first generation of Christians is found gathered into a more precise, connected, and homogeneous tradition; and in so far as the hypothesis of a slow, scattered evolution appears more untenable; so far also it becomes truly impossible for the naturalistic critic to write a merely natural history of that generation, and the expedients to which he has recourse

[1] W. Sanday, *Outlines*, p. 113.

appear more and more feeble. The genesis of Christianity becomes inexplicable except to him who admits in the life of Christ things which had been hitherto unheard-of.

III.

To the two expedients I have indicated, rationalistic critics of our day add a third, which is new, and consists in applying to Gospel history a method which undertakes great things, that of comparison of religions. The author of *Orpheus* is careful not to deprive himself of this argument, and, to tell the truth, this is the only interesting part of his book for us, since it is here alone that his chapter on "Christian Origins" becomes up-to-date.

The method of comparative religions can be practised in many different ways, of which the primary one is simply the historical method; but this is no novelty. The Gospel, Christianity, and Catholicism, so far as it is legitimate to distinguish between them, arose at one moment and in one set of surroundings. The historian, therefore, who wishes to construct a critical history of these three, must study those surroundings in the period at which they arose. He will find in such a study a supply of information which he cannot neglect, and which, although subordinate to the study of the subjects themselves, is still of great wealth. Only a week ago, by merely investigating some Aramaisms of the Gospel, and comparing the Evangelical parables with those of the Rabbis, you could see how much we gain by the comparative study of the Gospel and Palestinian

Judaism. This study has been carried out very thoroughly by modern historians; and the influence of Judaism in the time of the New Testament has been given its full value during the last fifty years.[1] I am not far from thinking that the study of the Jewish environment has nearly said its last word; yet it has not diminished the originality of the Gospel.

At the present day, a similar investigation is being made of the Hellenistic medium in which Christianity was propagated. It is sought to make a religious map of the old Græco-Roman world embodied in the Empire, to analyse the various phenomena of its religious sentiments, so diverse in origin and so mingled together; and to describe the currents of thought, or, as it is said nowadays, the *syncretisms;* so as to define "the aspirations of the Græco-Oriental religious efforts to realize a kind of shadow or vague outline of the spiritual life which we derive from the Gospel."[2]

Like all young sciences, this study opened with great pretensions, not the least amongst which was

[1] J. Weiss, *Die Aufgaben der neut. Wissenschaft* (Göttingen, 1908), p. 50, sends us back to the masterly work of E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People.* We can ourselves also cite the fine book of Lagrange, *Le messianisme chez les Juifs* (Paris, 1909).

[2] P. Allo, *L'Évangile en face du syncrétisme païen* (Paris, 1909), p. ii. The most notable book on these subjects is that of P. Wendland, *Die Hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum* (Tübingen, 1907). We have in French, without forgetting *La Religion romaine* (Paris, 1874) of G. Boissier, also more recently F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain* (Paris, 1906).

to conceive Christianity as a syncretism, born in the same environment as the others, but the one syncretism which succeeded. By this stroke the originality and independence of Christianity was discredited by a host of analogies and borrowings which had never before been suspected. Then, little by little, things settled down; critics no longer attempt to maintain what Gunkel declared seven years ago, that Christianity only, so to speak, matured its fruit at the moment when it passed from the East into the Greek world. To-day we have, on the one side, made it clear that Christianity was fully formed on Jewish soil before it entered into contact with the Greek world, and that it developed there while screened from all Græco-Oriental influence; and on the other hand, that the subsequent borrowings from Hellenism: vocabulary, philosophy, and customs, did not touch the new and essential element of Christianity, which is the Gospel, and the Gospel inseparably connected with Jesus in Person.[1]

J. Weiss has playfully said that the method of comparative religions has not escaped *Kinderkrankheiten*—children's diseases. One of these was the desire for an indefinite extension of the environment in which Christianity grew up, and the suggestion that as a syncretistic product it was not only Hellen-

[1] J. Weiss, *Aufgaben*, p. 50; J. Lebreton, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité*, p. xiv; Lagrange, *Revue biblique*, 1904, p. 271 (in a review of H. Gunkel's *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des N.T.* 1903), and also *Rev. bib.* 1909, p. 603 (review of C. Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N.T.* [Giessen, 1909]).

istic but also Egyptian, Persian, and Babylonian at the same time! Philologists fought for pan-Hellenism, and Orientalists for pan-Babylonianism.[1] But the Anthropologists go beyond them all.[2] For them there are no conditions either of history or geography in religious matters. Rites and myths connect with each other across time and space, without our having to prove any relationship—it is quite enough if there is a family likeness. Anthropologists in this way make the most unheard-of and preposterous discoveries, and they are the most misunderstood of our "comic authors."

As long as Salomon Reinach limited himself to essays like the one he entitled "Pieds Pudiques,"[3] he

[1] We may recall with a smile the attempt of P. Jensen, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur* (Strasburg, 1906), in answer to which it is only necessary to read the review by Bertholet in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1907, p. 603. On the pretended borrowings from Buddhism, see L. de la Vallée Poussin, "Le bouddisme et les Évangiles canoniques, à propos d'une publication récente," in the *Rev. bib.* 1906, p. 353.

[2] G. Foucart, *La méthode comparative dans l'histoire des religions* (Paris, 1909), p. 12: "We must be on our guard not to imitate the erratic conduct of the Anthropological school. They disdain history and geography, and aim at explaining all creeds and all customs of different nations by constant laws, everywhere and at all times equally efficacious."

[3] The Tchouwaches, Turkish women on the Volga, hold it indecent to show their feet. In China even the husband must not see his wife's bare feet. At the end of the seventeenth century the same etiquette was in force at the Court of Spain, if we can credit the Countess d'Aulnoy. Brantôme indicates the same custom in Italy at the beginning of the same century. A possibly analogous sentiment is to be divined in a verse in which Horace says that severe matrons wear a long robe which

merely raised a smile. But now he attempts to demonstrate by the same method that Jesus never was crucified. As a distinct person, He is already considered by this Anthropologist as unknowable to history, now He fades away into a myth, and becomes a figure analogous to Mithras or Attis; Christianity loses its founder and becomes a mere syncretism, a passing cloud. The miraculous Birth has been attacked by some critics and has been defended by believing exegetists,[1] so also the Resurrection,[2]—these, we may say, are discussions which will never have an end, between us who believe in the Divinity of Christ and rationalists who are determined to deprive the Gospel of everything supernatural. But no one in his senses, so far as I know, has hitherto

reaches to their toes. So also Ovid, to whom a long dress is a sign of modesty. What is all this? It is the *taboo of the feet.* This is the explanation of "a saying common in England in the prudish mid-Victorian days: *English Ladies have no feet.*" This makes a memoir of six pages, peremptorily showing the unsuspected existence of an ancestral taboo. We find it under the heading "Pieds Pudiques," in *Cultes, mythes et religions*, Vol. I (1905), p. 104. See also p. 114, the taboo on account of which the Pope has his meals alone, which is the same as the taboo observed by the inhabitants of the Baram district of Borneo. We might call it a supplement to *Bouvard et Pécuchet!*

[1] P. Durand, *L'Enfance de J. C., suivie d'une étude sur les frères du Seigneur* (Paris, 1908); J. Orr, *The Virginal Birth of Christ* (London, 1907).

[2] P. Ladeuze, *La résurrection du Christ devant la critique contemporaine* (Bruxelles, 1908); J. Orr, *The Resurrection of Jesus* (London, 1908); E. Mangenot, *La résurrection de Jésus, suivie de deux appendices sur la crucifixion et l'ascension* (Paris, 1910).

called in doubt and treated as mythical the Passion of Jesus. This paradox we owe to *Orpheus*.[1]

We must consider and weigh the arguments of *Orpheus*:—

1. "Less than a century after the Christian era," he writes, "no one knew precisely . . . when He (Jesus) died." I reply immediately that, although they could not give the consular or imperial year, it was known that He died at Jerusalem while Pontius Pilate was Procurator of Judæa, this Procuratorship having taken place between the years A.D. 26 and 36, during the reign of Tiberius.[2]

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 229 (337). See, however, W. B. Smith, *Der vorchristliche Jesus* (Giessen, 1906), or A. Drews, *Die Christusmythe* (Jena, 1909), which created such a stir!

[2] Pontius Pilate is known as Procurator of Judæa, thanks to Josephus and Philo. This latter in his *De legatione ad Caium*, 38 (ed. Mangey, Vol. II, p. 590), denounces his venality, insolence, and robberies, "his cruelties and his unjust and continual executions" (*τοὺς ἀκρίτους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους φόνους*). For all that is known of Pilate outside the Gospel sources, see Schürer, Vol. II, 82 (I. 488). Remember that the date "under Pontius Pilate" is attested by Tacitus (Pliny the Elder?), the Gospels and the Acts (III. 13; IV. 27; XIII. 28); St. Ignatius of Antioch, three times; St. Justin, six times; and the apocryphal Peter. We can here see if, in the first hundred years after the Passion, there was any doubt about the date "under Pontius Pilate." This fixed tradition cannot be counterbalanced by the suggestion of *Orpheus*, that the character of Pontius Pilate given by the Gospels "is . . . utterly unlike the real Pilate, that governor 'à la Russe' described by Josephus and Philo." This remark of Salomon Reinach reminds us of *Bouvard et Pécuchet* (ed. Lemerre, 1884), p. 189: "We should have quite another idea of Cæsar if Vercingetorix had written his commentaries."

2. The Passion never really took place; it is a myth composed of features taken from the rites of Babylon, Persia, and Egypt. "The circumstances of the Passion bear a most suspicious resemblance to rites that were in use at a much earlier period at certain festivals. At the so-called feast of the *Sacæa* in Babylonia and Persia, there was a triumphal procession of a condemned criminal dressed as a king; at the end of the festival he was stripped of his fine raiment, scourged, hanged, or crucified."

I reply :—

(*a*) Granting that the derision, to which Jesus was subjected by the soldiers in the Atrium of the palace, was a scene from a Babylonian carnival, how would this cause the fact of the Passion to become suspect? Because the roll of drums ordered by Santerre was a "rite" in use at less fatal parades, is the execution of Louis XVI the less an historic fact?

(*b*) But how are we to know, as a matter of fact, that the scene in which Jesus was robed in a red cloak, crowned with thorns, and, with a reed as sceptre in His hand, received the mock homage of the Roman cohort,—how are we to know that this was inspired by the Babylonian festival of *Sacæa?* Jesus had just been condemned as the so-called King of the Jews, and the Roman soldiers, while waiting for the moment of leading Him to execution, turn Him into derision and overwhelm Him with humiliating buffooneries. The contempt they felt towards the Jews, joined to their gross cruelty as the body-guard of a tyrannical governor, are sufficient to explain the abominable mockery suggested to them

by the wording of the sentence pronounced against the "King of the Jews," without our having to invoke so exotic a practice as the *Sacæa*. The most characteristic and barbarous features of that festival, moreover, were not reproduced in the Passion.[1]

We will continue.

3. *Orpheus* wishes to persuade us that the Passion contains a "ritual and mystical" element. His second reason is that: "We know from Philo that the populace of Alexandria gave the name *Karabas* to one of these improvised kings, who was overwhelmed with mock honours and afterwards ill-treated. But *Karabas* has no meaning, either in Aramaic or Greek. It must be emended to read *Barabas*,[2] which means

[1] Loisy, *Synoptiques*, Vol. II, p. 653: "If they treated Jesus as a mock king, they were prompted by the circumstances of the case—we might even say by the very tenor of the sentence." Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques* (Paris, 1905), p. 289.

For a description of the *Sacæa*, see Lagrange, p. 287: "It is a Bacchanalian feast continued night and day; the people dressed themselves as Scythians, they drank and fought, men and women together. . . . The king of the masquerade could allow himself any licence, even to using the concubines of the king, but at the end of the feast he is stripped of his royal robes, scourged, and hanged."

The comparison of the Passion to the feast of *Sacæa* was proposed by Wendland (1898), and by Frazer (1900). Salomon Reinach sees in it a ray of light which explains everything. Still, in his *Cultes, mythes et religions*, Vol. I (1905), under the heading "the tortured king," p. 337, he wrote: "Assuredly, and Frazer cordially agrees with me, we can have no more than a coincidence here."

[2] The proper spelling is *Barabbas* (Βαραββᾶς).—[*Translator's note:* The spelling Barabbas has been inserted in the English

in Aramaic, 'Son of the Father.' In the Gospels we see Jesus called the King of the Jews, crowned with thorns, clad in a purple robe, and given a reed for a sceptre (*Matt.* XXVII. 26-31); He was there treated exactly like a *Barabas*. But what are we then to believe of the incident of the seditious Barabas, and of the choice given to the populace between Jesus and Barabas? . . . By comparing these various statements, we are led to the conclusion that Jesus was put to death, not *instead* of *Barabas*, but in the *character* of a *Barabas*. The Evangelists neither understood the ceremony they described nor the nature of the derisive honours bestowed on Jesus; they made a myth of what was probably only a rite. If there is an historic fact imbedded in their narratives, it is so overlaid with legend that it is impossible to disengage it." [1]

I reply:—

(*a*) Granting that the derisive honours, to which Jesus was subject at the hands of Pilate's soldiers in the Atrium of the palace, were in imitation of an Alexandrian carnival, how would that cause the fact of the Passion to become suspect?

(*b*) Barabbas, in Aramaic Bar-Abba, does not signify "son of the father," which would be meaningless, but "son of a Rabbi." St. Jerome found it

translation of *Orpheus*, which claims to have the author's general sanction. As however no explanation of this change is given, I have retained the spelling of the original. The correction only shifts, and does not answer the difficulty, since it makes it still more arbitrary to alter the Alexandrian name.]

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 229 (338).

translated in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* as "Filius magistri eorum."[1]

(*c*) We can go further. The name is not written Barabas in Greek but Barabbas, and we see that it is a patronymic.[2] "Orpheus" thus mutilates a name and then says: The name used at the Alexandrian festival has been mutilated; it could not be *Karabas*,[3] but should be *Barabas*. A twofold fault of criticism; an inexact reading, and an arbitrary correction.

(*d*) There is still more to be said. *Orpheus* quotes Philo, and Philo alone, to prove that "the populace of Alexandria gave the name *Karabas* to one of these improvised kings, who was overwhelmed with mock honours and afterwards ill-treated." Now, if you verify the reference, you will find that Philo says nothing of the kind, or at least nothing to the purpose. Philo is speaking of an incident which took place in the autumn of A.D. 38, during the visit to

[1] Nestle, *Supplement*, p. 79. If it be true that the full name of Barabbas was "Jesus Barabbas" (Peter was called Simon Bariona), as Origen thought, the name of Barabbas would be all the more that of an individual. As to this assertion of Origen's, see Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in Original Greek* (Cambridge, 1881), Append. p. 19.

[2] Swete, *Mark*, p. 370, cites two Rabbis of this name: R. Samuel Bar Abba and R. Nathan Bar Abba. Lagrange, *Notes on "Orpheus,"* on p. 32 (45), shows that this is quite a common name.

[3] Lagrange, *Quelques Remarques*, p. 34 (48), calls our attention to an inscription at Palmyra which contains קרבא (qeraba = war, battle), used as the name of a female. "It would," he says, "suit a man even better."

Alexandria of Herod-Agrippa I, to whom the favour of Caligula had granted the Tetrarchy of Philip, with the title of King.[1] The Alexandrians, being anti-semitic and always ready to scoff at anything, welcomed this crowned Jew with obscene jests and songs; nor were they the whole populace of Alexandria, but the young men of the Gymnasium—the "Latin Quarter" of the place. They even thought out a more continued jest: they took a poor and harmless idiot, who usually wandered quite naked through the streets and was the butt of the passers-by; they brought him into the Gymnasium, set him on a high seat and crowned him with paper; they robed him in a carpet and gave him a strip of papyrus as a sceptre, appointed a mock body-guard, saluted him as King, begged him to administer justice, spoke to him of State affairs, called him respectfully *Marin*, the Aramaic for *Lord;* and all this in order to make a mockery of King Agrippa; it was a piece of buffoonery worthy of a Paris studio. It is true that the poor idiot was named *Karabas* (*ὄνομα καραβᾶς*); but it is not a carnival name. He was called *Karabas*, as he might have been called *Theonas*, *Archillas*, or *Kaor*. When the farce was over, they let him go without doing him the slightest harm.[2]

Salomon Reinach has taken an incident for a custom, an improvised jest for an annual festival, and has never suspected, perhaps from not re-reading his Philo, that the students of Alexandria, antisemitic

[1] Schürer, Vol. I, p. 552.

[2] Philo, *Adversus Flaccum* (ed. Mangey), Vol. II, p. 521.

and seditious, were that day mocking at the Jews as being friends of Cæsar.

(*e*) We have not yet ended. Remember that this distorted text of Philo, this idiot who is an institution, this *Karabas* who is *Barabas*, and this *Barabbas* who is *Barabas*, and Jesus who is a *Barabas*—all this jugglery is to prove that "the Evangelists neither understood the ceremony they described nor the nature of the derisive honours bestowed on Jesus." And therefore that it is impossible to disentangle from legend the historic fact of the Passion of the Saviour! What more could be done to discredit a system?

IV.

We must make haste to finish, Gentlemen, for it is growing late, and I cannot close this discussion without saying one word as to a last expedient of the naturalistic critic, taken from another new science, that of the history of dogma.

It is most true that ecclesiastical dogmas have developed, and they did not receive their definite and abstract formulæ except after long controversial labour. Dogmatical terms such as *consubstantial*, *hypostatic union*, or *Papal infallibility* are not to be found in the Gospel in their definite and defining form. It is sufficient for us that the Gospel (without dissociating tradition from it) gives us an historical statement, and that we should be able to prove the course and lawfulness of the development which connects defined faith and revealed faith.[1]

[1] Gardeil, *Le donné révélé et la théologie* (Paris, 1910), p. 151. I may be excused for referring to my own essay: "Le sens et

We have witnessed considerable efforts, during the last few years, on the part of naturalistic critics to eliminate from the Gospel, or to speak in the fashionable way, from the message of Jesus, every trace of dogma and sacrament. They have gone to the deepest roots of the Gospel, and raised doubts as to whether Jesus ever believed Himself to be the Messiah, and they thus convert the Divine Master into so humble a Jewish Rabbi, with such poverty of view, and so limited an horizon, that we no longer understand how He could have been even the mere starting-point of a movement which was able to pass beyond Him and become Christianity.

You will come across statements of this kind: "The idea that Jesus was the Messiah and that He was God is clearly formulated in the fourth Gospel, but in the first three Gospels it appears in embryo only." . . . "Jesus taught no dogmas of any sort, nor anything resembling the sacraments of the Church. . . ." "The idea of redemption appears only in the passages interpolated under the influence of St. Paul's preaching. . . ."[1] If you do meet with assertions like these, I beg you to keep the following three considerations firmly before your minds:—

1. As we said above, the Person and actions of Jesus include some things hitherto unheard-of; and these are expressed by the first Christians and by St. Paul in terms which exceed all human analogy. Jesus is the Son whom God has sent in the fullness of

les limites de l'histoire des dogmes," in the *Questions d'enseignement supérieur* (Paris, 1907), p. 145.

[1] *Orpheus*, pp. 224-5 (329-31).

time; He is God's own Son, and in Him God has reconciled the world to Himself, for we have been reconciled to God by the death of His Son.[1] Thus the faith of the first generation of Christians, the faith of those who were contemporary with the immediate witnesses of Christ, the faith which was preached by the company with Peter, James, and John, this faith expresses itself in a transcendental conception of the Person and work of Jesus.[2] St. Paul did not create the dogmatism of the Incarnation and Redemption; this dogmatic teaching was part of the faith of all, it alone explains the faith of all, and if we allow twenty years for this dogmatism to elaborate itself in the collective consciousness, the rapidity and convergence of this evolution would still remain a disconcerting enigma.[3]

[1] For further details, see my *Enseignement de Jésus*, p. 211. And for a fuller treatment of the whole subject, J. Lebreton, p. 289.

[2] Lebreton, p. 260; Rose, *Études évangéliques*, p. 218. Cf. A. Loisy, *Synoptiques*, Vol. I, p. 176: "If the thoughts of Paul turn, in a sense, about the Passion and Resurrection, to make them the basis of Christian theology, it is because this already formed the central point of Apostolic preaching." So also Harnack, *What is Christianity?* p. 161 (164).

[3] J. Weiss, *Christus, die Anfänge des Dogmas* (Tübingen, 1909), p. 4: "The deeper we penetrate into the origins of Christology, the greater is the astonishment we experience at seeing the rapidity with which the most diverse views have brought about a very far-reaching and very difficult doctrine. Of gradual evolution there is no trace; in the shortest time the Christological system is complete; and in the New Testament the leading conceptions of the dogmatism to come are already implied, if only in germ."

2. The most authentic teaching of the Divine Master also contains assertions which surpass all human analogy. I quoted to you in their place the passages in which Jesus thanks His heavenly Father, because all things are given to the Son by the Father, that no one knoweth the Son but the Father, and no one knoweth the Father, but the Son and he to whom the Son chooses to reveal Him.[1] The Gospel of St. John, with its revelation of what Jesus Himself gives of the mystery of His own being, is here *in nuce*, in the verses I have quoted from Matthew and Luke. To say that Jesus was convinced that He was the Messiah,[2] is not enough for the historian. Jesus gave out that He was the perfection of the Messianic character, and He transformed that character by affirming that He went beyond it in His Divine Sonship; and this was an assertion quite unexpected by the Jews of Gospel times.[3] This assertion by Jesus of His

[1] See above, p. 141. J. Lebreton, p. 245: "We readily acknowledge that Johannine theology could add nothing to these words." For a proof of the authenticity of the words, see *ibid.* p. 470.

[2] Harnack, *What is Christianity?* p. 276 (140): "Some scholars of note, among them Wellhausen, have expressed a doubt whether Jesus described Himself as the Messiah. In that doubt I cannot concur . . . we may remain quite sure that Jesus called Himself the Messiah." So also Dalman, pp. 248-59; Wernle, *Anfänge*, p. 26; Loisy, Vol. I, p. 240.

[3] J. Lebreton, pp. 151, 242: "The term *Son of God* not being at that time an accepted manner of designating the Messiah, and never being found with that meaning, either in the Old Testament or in Jewish apocrypha, we must explain the new use of the term by a new belief" (p. 246); Rose, p. 183.

Sonship is the revealed fact which the Church afterwards translated into the dogma of the "consubstantial."

3. I could continue, but I wish to pass to the other unheard-of part, that of the sacraments. I not only refer to the famous saying against which redoubled and passionate attacks are made: "All power is given Me in heaven and on earth; go, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost;"[1] but I refer to the still more unheard-of assertion, and one better attested than any other in the Gospel—the words of Jesus at the Last Supper: "Take, this is My body; take, this is My blood, the blood of the alliance, which shall be shed for you."[2] Here we have revealed by Jesus, at the most unforgettable of all moments for His Apostles, by acts and words which were to be perpetuated in a liturgy as primitive as that of Christian baptism,[3] here we have revealed

[1] J. Lebreton, p. 478, proves the authenticity of these words.

[2] For the historic accuracy of these words, and their meaning, in the institution of the Eucharist, I will refer to my *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive*, II (Paris, 1906), p. 3. Legrange, *Notes*, p. 11 (15), shows to what nonsense the method of "comparative religion" conducts Reinach on the subject of the Eucharist. Consult also, with necessary reserve, M. Goguel, *L'Eucharistie, des origines à Justin martyr* (Paris, 1910), p. 293.

[3] J. Armitage Robinson, *The Study of the Gospels* (London, 1903), p. 8, says with great truth: "No man can explain why any particular celebration of the Eucharist takes place at all, if it be not because from the very beginning Christ was believed to have done a similar act on the evening before He was crucified."

that unheard-of element, at the same time mysterious and adorable, which alone adequately explains Christianity through Jesus Christ.

After all this, if *Orpheus* comes to tell us that "the historic Jesus is essentially intangible," . . . that nothing is left to us of all the Gospel story "from the stable at Bethlehem to Golgotha," except "Christianity remains, which is not only a great institution, but the mightiest spiritual force which has ever transformed souls, a force which continues to evolve in them," [1] we shake our heads and say: We do not know, and cannot historically understand a Christianity from which Christ is lacking, for Christianity is "a religion sprung from a living person, and having no meaning apart from Him." [2] Christianity without Christ would be, perhaps, the liberal Protestantism of Meyer, which does not differ in the least from the liberal Judaism of Montefiore; [3] but for us historians, these apostles of an after season are not so worthy of belief as the Apostles of the first hour, those who ate and drank with the Lord; we trust to their experiences and their testimony, and we cannot imagine that the true faith of to-day can be different from theirs.

We might make a summary of all the errors we have noted in each paragraph of one single chapter of *Orpheus*, that on "Christian Origins," and we

[1] *Orpheus*, p. 232 (341).

[2] Lebreton, p. xvii. Cf. *L'Enseignement de Jésus*, p. 302.

[3] Arnold Meyer, *Was uns Jesus heute ist* (Tübingen, 1907), in the famous *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*; C. F. Montefiore, *The Synoptical Gospels* (London, 1910).

might speak severely about them; but what good should we obtain by enlarging on them?

I prefer to dwell upon the thought that, in going more deeply into the Gospel by the light of history, you will have found your confidence in it growing far beyond the certainty which you had perhaps not fully possessed before now. I shall be still more happy, if some pious souls who have been in doubt as to their way, shall find in this inquiry the reasons for belief which have been hitherto wanting to them.

Providence will perhaps allow that the teaching which has been set before you from this chair during the last two months may convey to others at a distance the certainty which you have found here. The merit will be due to your apostolic Bishop who has called us together, and to you all, Gentlemen, who, by your attention and sympathy have brought about, under God, that our undertaking has not been in vain.

ABERDEEN: THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

APPENDIX

TO THE

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL

APPENDIX

TO THE

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL

"ORPHEUS" ET L'EVANGILE

BY

MONSEIGNEUR PIERRE BATIFFOL

TRANSLATED BY

REV. G. C. H. POLLEN, S.J.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA
1912

APPENDIX.

By the Translator.

On the decisions of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, 19 June, 1911, and 26 June, 1912.

After the publication of this translation, in May, 1911, an important decision was pronounced by the Pontifical Biblical Commission on the first Gospel, and another a year later on the second and third Gospels, and on the "Synoptic Question". The decisions take the form of questions and answers, of which the following is a translation.

Concerning the Authorship, the Time of Composition, and the Historic Truth of the Gospel According to Matthew.

The following doubts having been submitted, the Pontifical Commission "de re Biblica" has decreed that they should be answered as follows:—

I. Whether, considering the universal and constant agreement of the Church from the first centuries, clearly indicated in the explicit testimony of the Fathers; in the inscriptions of the codices of the Gospels; in the versions, even those most ancient, of the Sacred Books; and in the Catalogues handed down by the holy Fathers, by ecclesiastical writers, by the Supreme Pontiffs, and by the Councils; and lastly in the liturgical custom both of

the Eastern and Western Church ; it can and must be certainly affirmed that Matthew, the Apostle of Christ, is truly the author of the Gospel current under his name ? Ans. : Affirmatively.

II. Whether the testimony of tradition is to be considered sufficient to support the opinion which holds that Matthew both wrote before the other Evangelists, and also that he wrote the first Gospel in the vernacular tongue then in use among the Jews of Palestine, for whom the work was intended. Ans. : Affirmatively to both parts.

III. Whether the composition of this original text can be postponed to a time after the destruction of Jerusalem, so that the prophecies read there about that same destruction might have been written after the event ; or whether the testimony of Irenaeus, which is usually alleged (*Adv. haeres.*, lib. III, cap. I, n. 2), of uncertain and disputed interpretation, is to be esteemed of such weight as to force us to reject the opinion of those who, in closer accord with tradition, hold that this composition was made even before the arrival of Paul in Rome ? Ans. : Negatively to both parts.

IV. Whether that opinion of some moderns can be held as even probable, according to which Matthew did not, in the proper and strict sense, compose the Gospel such as it has been handed down to us, but only some collection of sayings or discourses of Christ, which were used as a source by another anonymous author, whom they make out to be the real composer of the Gospel ? Ans. : Negatively.

V. Whether, from the fact that all the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, yea, the Church herself from her very cradle, not even excepting those who expressly hand down that Matthew the Apostle wrote in the vernacular tongue, have used as canonical only the Greek text of the Gospel known under the name of Matthew, it can certainly be proved that this same Greek Gospel is substantially identical with the Gospel composed by the same Apostle in the vernacular tongue ? Ans. : Affirmatively.

VI. Whether, from the fact that the object aimed at by the author of the first Gospel was principally dogmatic and apolo-

getic, namely that of demonstrating to the Jews that Jesus was the Messias foretold by the Prophets and born from David's stock, and further, from the fact that, in arranging the acts and words which he narrates and reports, he does not always keep to the chronological order, one may lawfully conclude that these are not to be taken as true; or again, whether one can maintain that the accounts of the actions and discourses of Christ, which are read in the same Gospel, have undergone a certain change and adaptation under the influence of the prophecies of the Old Testament and of the more advanced state of the Church, and are not therefore in conformity with historic truth? Ans.: Negatively to both parts.

VII. Whether, in particular, the opinions of those ought rightly to be held destitute of foundation, who call in doubt the historic authenticity of the first two chapters, in which the genealogy and infancy of Christ are narrated, as also certain passages of great dogmatic importance, such as those concerning the primacy of Peter (*Matt.* xvi. 17-19), the form of Baptism given to the Apostles with the universal commission to preach (*Matt.* xxviii. 19-20), the Apostles' profession of faith in the divinity of Christ (*Matt.* xiv. 33), and others of like import, which occur in Matthew in a peculiar form? Ans.: Affirmatively.

These replies were confirmed by Pope Pius X on 19 June, 1911, and are promulgated under the signatures of the two Consultors *Ab Actis*, Fulcranus Vigouroux, Pr. S.S., and Laurentius Janssens, O.S.B.

Concerning the Authorship, the Time of Composition, and the Historic Truth of the Gospels According to Mark and Luke.

The following doubts having been submitted, the Pontifical Commission "de re Biblica" has decreed that they shall be answered as follows:—

I. Whether the clear testimony of tradition, wonderful in its consistency from the beginning of the Church, and founded upon manifold arguments, namely the express witness of the holy Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, the quotations and references

occurring in their writings, the use made of the Gospels by the earlier heretics, the versions of the books of the New Testament, the earliest and almost all other MS. codices, and also internal reasons drawn from the text itself of the Sacred Books, force us to affirm as a certainty that Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, and Luke the physician, the assistant and companion of Paul, are truly the authors of the Gospels respectively attributed to them? Ans. : Affirmatively.

II. Whether the reasons, by which some critics seek to prove that the last twelve verses of the Gospel of Mark (*Mark* XVI. 9-20), were not written by Mark himself, but were added by another hand, are such as to give us the right to assert that these verses are not to be accepted as inspired and canonical; or at least that they prove Mark not to have been the author of these verses? Ans. : Negatively to both parts.

III. Whether, in a similar manner, it is lawful to doubt about the inspiration and canonicity of the account by Luke of the Infancy of Christ (*Luke* I. 11), or of the appearance of an angel comforting Jesus and of the sweat of blood (*Luke* XXII. 43-44); or whether at least it can be shown by solid reasons—according to a view maintained by early heretics and viewed with favour by some recent critics—that these accounts do not belong to the genuine Gospel of Luke? Ans. : Negatively to both parts.

IV. Whether those very rare and altogether unique documents, in which the Canticle *Magnificat* is attributed not to the Blessed Virgin Mary but to Elizabeth, can or ought to prevail in any manner against the unanimous agreement of nearly all the codices, both of the original Greek text and of the versions, and against the interpretation demanded as well by the context as by the disposition of the Virgin herself, and the constant tradition of the Church? Ans. : Negatively.

V. Whether, with regard to the chronological order of the Gospels it is lawful to withdraw from that view which, supported by the testimony of a tradition both very ancient and constant, witnesses that, after Matthew, who, first of all, wrote his Gospel in his mother-tongue, Mark was the second to write and Luke the third; or whether we are to hold that this view is incon-

sistent with the opinion asserting that the second and third Gospels were written before the Greek version of the first Gospel? Ans.: Negatively to both parts.

VI. Whether it is lawful to postpone the time of composition of the Gospels of Mark and Luke until after the city of Jerusalem was destroyed; or, whether because in Luke the prophecies of the Lord regarding the destruction of that city seem to be more definite, one can maintain that his Gospel at least was written after the siege was begun? Ans. Negatively to both parts.

VII. Whether it should be affirmed that the Gospel of Luke is earlier than the Acts of the Apostles (*Acts* I. 1-2); and, since this book, by the same Luke, was completed about the end of the Apostle's captivity in Rome (*Acts* XXVIII. 30-31), that his Gospel was not composed subsequent to that time? Ans.: Affirmatively.

VIII. Whether, keeping before our eyes both the evidence of tradition and internal arguments, as to the sources which each of the Evangelists employed in writing his Gospel, we can prudently call in doubt the view which holds that Mark wrote in accordance with the preaching of Peter, and Luke in accordance with the preaching of Paul; and at the same time asserts that these Evangelists also had at hand other sources worthy of credit, either oral or already consigned to writing? Ans.: Negatively.

IX. Whether the sayings and actions, which are accurately and as it were graphically narrated by Mark in accordance with the preaching of Peter, and sincerely set forth by Luke, "having diligently attained to all things from the beginning" from witnesses entirely worthy of credit, seeing that from the beginning they were "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (*Luke* I. 2-3), rightly claim for themselves that full historical credit which the Church has always ascribed to them; or whether, on the contrary, these same sayings and actions are to be held as, at least in part, destitute of historic truth, either because the writers were not eye-witnesses, or because in each Evangelist we not infrequently detect defects of order or discrepancies as to the succession of events, or because, since they came and

wrote at a later date, they necessarily reported ideas foreign to the mind of Christ and the Apostles, and events more or less distorted by popular imagination, or lastly, because each according to the end he had in view indulged in preconceived dogmatic ideas? Ans.: Affirmatively to the first part, negatively to the second part.

On the Synoptic Question, or on the Mutual Relationship Between the First Three Gospels.

The following doubts having been submitted, the Pontifical Commission "de re Biblica" has decreed that they shall be answered as follows:—

I. Whether, observing the things prescribed as to be observed by all in the foregoing decrees, especially as to the authenticity and integrity of the three Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, as to the substantial identity of the Greek Gospel of Matthew with its primitive original, and also as to the order of time in which the same were written, it is lawful to exegetes, in order to explain the similarities and dissimilarities of the Gospels towards each other, amidst so many different and conflicting opinions, to discuss freely and to appeal to hypotheses of tradition, either written or oral, and also of the dependence of any one on its predecessor or predecessors? Ans.: Affirmatively.

II. Whether those are to be considered as observing what is established above, who, supported by no evidence of tradition nor historic arguments, easily embrace the hypothesis commonly called the "two-document hypothesis," which strives to explain the composition of the Greek Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke chiefly by their dependence on the Gospel of Mark and on a so-called collection of sayings of the Lord; and whether therefore they may freely defend this hypothesis? Ans.: Negatively to both parts.

These replies were confirmed by Pope Pius X on 26 June, 1912, and are promulgated under the signatures of the two Consultors *Ab Actis*, Fulcranus Vigouroux, Pr. S.S., and Laurentius Janssens, O.S.B.

The majority of these replies are a welcome confirmation of the position so ably taken up by the author of the lectures, especially those which refer to the historic truth of the Gospels and to the time at which they were composed. Some of the matters dealt with by the Biblical Commission are not referred to, or are only mentioned incidentally in this work, such as the questions concerning the *Magnificat* and the Infancy.

The answers on the "two-document hypothesis" and on the priority of Matthew are the two points on which the decrees are most at variance with the theories explained in the lecture on "The Gospels".[1] Even here, however, we must carefully note the precise scope of the decrees. We cannot, indeed, hold that Matthew employed our Gospel of Mark as a source, but we are encouraged, or at least left free to hold that the Evangelists did have recourse to earlier sources, either written or oral. In any case, the decisions of the Biblical Commission do not impair the force of the general argument of the lecture. Mgr. Batiffol had already proved that the Church accepted four Gospels on the authority of as many Apostles, and we have seen how careful Luke was in obtaining accurate information for the Acts, and we have studied the opportunities he had for learning the truth. The lecture on the Gospels sets out to prove that in all three Synoptics,[2] the information is equally accurate and is derived ultimately from the actual hearers and eye-witnesses of the sayings and actions of Christ in Palestine. In this investigation it becomes a secondary question whether we believe that one Evangelist actually had another Gospel before him, or whether they both employed one

[1] P. 122, note ; 124, 129, 134 *et seq.*

[2] The fourth Gospel is not appealed to in the subsequent lectures.

and the same written source, or whether their sources, though slightly differing from each other, were yet eventually derived from one and the same oral tradition.

Matthew, being himself "an eye-witness and minister of the word," would not have needed to apply to others to the same extent as Mark and Luke, but we are not obliged to believe that even he limited his account to matters that passed under his own eyes. In fact this could not have been the case with regard to his account of the Infancy.

Nor do the new decrees require us to hold that the three Synoptic Evangelists are wholly independent of each other, but only that our Gospel of Mark was not actually a source of Matthew. It still remains reasonable to hold that they are both derived in part from some common origin, oral or written. Neither does there appear any clear intention to rule out a common source of some kind for those parts of Matthew which are peculiar to himself and Luke. It is natural to suppose that all such common sources would have first taken shape in Aramaic, though they would have been translated almost immediately into Greek, since this language was in common use by the side of the Semitic tongue. It will be observed that the Commission does not condemn the opinion that Luke has drawn directly from Mark; and although the Greek of Matthew is substantially the same as the Aramaic, it may have been influenced by reference to the other Gospels or their sources during the process of translation.

As we have already said, these questions, although of great importance in themselves, are only secondary to the line of argument followed out by Mgr. Batiffol. His object is purely historical, to show that the ultimate source of all the Gospel narratives is the Palestinian tradition. He was willing to concede as much as seemed to have any

probability in the arguments and conclusions of non-Catholic higher critics, and shows that in spite of such concessions the historic value of the Gospels is in no way lessened but rather enhanced. These critics reject the principle of authority, so strongly insisted upon by our author,[1] and are unlikely therefore to be influenced by the present decisions, but we can still say to them that according to their own premises our conclusions are valid.

This appendix has been submitted to the author for his approval.

G. C. H. P.

July, 1912.

We take the opportunity of the publication of this appendix to point out three errata:—

P. 19, line 5 from end: read man for men.

P. 48 „ 12 „ „ „ A.D. 350 for 150.

P. 171 note 2 „ „ „ סתא „ מתא.

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY NEW YORK

[1] P. 50 *et seq.*

232.99
B 32 E